

198173

JPRS-TAC-86-050

25 JUNE 1986

## Worldwide Report

# ARMS CONTROL

**DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 2**

**DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A**  
Approved for Public Release  
Distribution Unlimited

19990426 071

**FBIS**

**FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE**

REPRODUCED BY  
NATIONAL TECHNICAL  
INFORMATION SERVICE  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

9  
108  
A06

#### NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

#### PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

25 JUNE 1986

## WORLDWIDE REPORT

## ARMS CONTROL

## CONTENTS

## SDI AND SPACE ARMS

Soviet General on U.S. Claims, Real Motives for SDI (Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 3 Jun 86).....	1
Soviet May-June Reports on U.S. Debate Over SDI (Moscow TASS, various dates; Moscow PRAVDA, 5 Jun 86).....	4
Pressure on Congressmen	4
White House Confirms Intentions	4
NASA 'Increasing Military Bias'	5
Reagan 'Lies' in Funding Message	6
Abrahamson Seeks More Funding	7
Japan Moving Toward SDI Involvement (Moscow PRAVDA, 15 Apr 86).....	8
French 'Cohabitation' Showing Strains Over SDI (Moscow in French to France and Belgium, 31 May 86).....	10

## U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

UK Group in USSR Discusses Gorbachev Arms Cuts Proposal (Various sources, various dates).....	12
Delegation Members	12
Meeting With Gorbachev	13
Talks With Voss	13
Whitelaw Comments, Whitelaw Interview	14
Arms Deal Ruled Out, by Chris Moncrieff	15

Labour MP Lamond Interviewed	16
Received by Gromyko	18
Discuss Disarmament	18
Talks Continue	19
Dobrynin Receives Healey	21

#### SALT-START ISSUES

USSR: 4 June Press Conference on Reagan SALT II Decision (Various sources, 5, 6 Jun 86).....	22
PRAVDA Report	22
IZVESTIYA Report	24
KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Report	28
Moscow Talk Show on U.S.-European Strains (Moscow Domestic Service, 8 Jun 86).....	34

#### EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

TASS: CSSR Delegate Addresses MBFR Session (Moscow TASS, 30 May 86).....	40
IZVESTIYA Sees Potential for 'Successful' CDE Conclusion (Moscow IZVESTIYA, 27, 29 May 86).....	41
Correspondent's Dispatch	41
Foreign Ministry Spokesman	43
FRG Papers View Gorbachev's East Berlin Speech (Various sources, various dates).....	44
Proposals Said To Aim at Post-Reagan Era, Editorial, by Karl-Heinz Baum	44
Proposals Called Primarily 'Propaganda', Editorial, by Fritz Ullrich Fack	45
Lothar Ruehl's Analysis, by Lothar Ruehl	47
Proposals Seen Aimed at Soviet Bureaucracy, by Christoph Bertram	50

#### NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

Lown Message Hails Test Moratorium Extension (Moscow PRAVDA, 18 May 86).....	55
USSR: Physicians Against Nuclear War Congress Urges Test Ban (Various sources, various dates).....	56
Gorbachev Message	56
Lown, Rau Addresses	56
Lessons of Chernobyl	58

Appeal to U.S., USSR	59
Press Conference	61
USSR's Chazov Interviewed	61
TASS Interviews U.S. Protestor at Nevada Test Site (Moscow TASS, 21 May 86).....	63
RELATED ISSUES	
TASS: Possibility of Winning War Guides U.S. Strategy (Moscow TASS, 4 Jun 86).....	64
CPSU's Vorotnikov on U.S. Response to Soviet Initiatives (Moscow PRAVDA, 29 May 86).....	66
Further on Naval Discussion at UN Disarmament Commission (Moscow TASS, 20 May 86).....	69
TASS: UN Disarmament Head Holds Press Conference in Moscow (Moscow TASS, 26 May 86).....	71
TASS on Proposed UN Conference on Disarmament, Development (Moscow TASS, 3 Jun 86).....	73
USSR Hosts Scientists Conference Against Nuclear War (Various sources, 27-29 May 86).....	75
Fedoseyev Preview	75
Fedoseyev Addresses Group	77
Academy President on Issues	77
Velikhov on Limited War, SDI	78
Dobrynin Conference Report	78
Forum Appeals to World Scientists	83
Conference Ends	84
Japanese Foreign Minister Discusses Security Issues in Moscow (Moscow TASS, 30 May 86; Moscow PRAVDA, 1, 2 Jun 86).....	85
Gorbachev on INF, SDI	85
Shevardnadze, Abe Speeches	86
PRAVDA Carries Joint Communique	88
Soviet Army Paper Addresses Asian Security Issues (Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 5 Jun 86).....	90
Gorbachev Writes Preface to Speech Anthology Published in UK (Moscow World Service, 6 Jun 86).....	93
PRAVDA Reviews UK MP's Visit, NATO CW Plans (Moscow PRAVDA, 1 Jun 86).....	95

Soviet Talk Show: Asian Security, INF, SALT, Test Ban, CW  
(Moscow Domestic Service, 1 Jun 86)..... 97

Briefs

Soviet-Bulgarian Consultations 102  
Architects Against Nuclear War 102

/6539

## SDI AND SPACE ARMS

### SOVIET GENERAL ON U.S. CLAIMS, REAL MOTIVES FOR SDI

PM050836 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Jun 86 Second Edition p 3

[Candidate of Military Sciences Major General F. Gontar (Reserve) article under the rubric "United States -- Citadel of Reaction and Militarism": "Washington's Nuclear Ambitions"]

[Text] Many foreign political and public organizations and sober-minded statesmen and politicians in the West have perceived the Soviet Union's extension of its unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests through 6 August this year as an exceptionally important, constructive initiative.

At the same time, the nuclear explosions being carried out one after another in Nevada (United States) appear particularly sinister against the background of the goodwill displayed by the USSR. They are designed, in particular, to perfect nuclear devices under the "star wars" program.

We recently saw the 3d anniversary of the U.S. President's announcement of that program, disguised as the "Strategic Defense Initiative." The groundless claims that it was conceived for purely defensive purposes have been exposed even by many Western specialists, including American ones, as a gross deception of naive people. In fact, it is a question, above all, of the creation [sozdaniye] of space-strike arms for offensive, aggressive purposes. It is planned to cram space with combat means such as rapid-fire electromagnetic guns, satellites with small-sized homing subprojectiles, nuclear explosive devices of very different types, and others. They are designed both to hit targets in space and to make strikes against ground, sea, and air targets.

This question occurs to people unversed in politics: Why is the U.S. Administration clinging so stubbornly to its SDI and accelerating its implementation? There are two main reasons for this. The first is the desire at all costs to achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union. As is known, all previous attempts have failed. Space has now been chosen as the arena of confrontation, where Washington entertains the illusion that it will forge ahead and overtake the USSR by relying on the most modern technology. The second reason is the insatiable appetite of the U.S. military-industrial complex, which reckons on making fabulous profits out of the arms race. This is why, contrary to common sense and in defiance of protests from the world public, including the American public, fulfillment of the "star wars" program is not only not being curtailed but is continuing on an ever increasing scale -- which threatens mankind with unpredictable consequences.

As M.S. Gorbachev declared, the accident at Chernobyl once again brought to light what an abyss will open up if nuclear war befalls mankind; the stockpiled nuclear arsenals are fraught with thousands upon thousands of disasters far more terrible than that at Chernobyl. The nuclear age imperiously demands a new approach to international relations and the pooling of efforts by states with different social systems in the name of ending the pernicious arms race and radically improving the world political climate.

However, the U.S. ruling circles are moving in the diametrically opposite direction. This is convincingly shown by the President's decision, announced on 27 May, not to continue observing the Soviet-American legal and contractual documents on limiting strategic offensive arms and also by the American Administration's desire to strive at all costs to realize its nuclear space ambitions.

In order to conceal the sinister nature of this program the U.S. mass media are throwing caution to the wind, as the saying goes. To start with, they promoted the fairy tale that this program is of a "nonnuclear" nature and will render nuclear weapons "unnecessary" and "useless." But then reports came to light (it proved impossible to conceal them) that the space-strike arms will include x-ray lasers powered by explosions of special nuclear devices. Then supporters of SDI began claiming that x-ray lasers pumped by nuclear explosions are not so dangerous since they comprise just one of several components of space-based weapons.

In reality, the fact that the "star wars" program provides for the creation [sozdaniye] of not only a space x-ray laser but also a number of other so-called "third-generation" nuclear devices which could be used in strike arms is carefully concealed from the American public. According to data cited in the American press, the "third-generation" nuclear charge devices now being developed [razrabatyvat] in the interests of the "star wars" program include the following:

Nuclear explosive devices that create a directed stream of a large number of destructive elements. Moving at hypersonic velocities, they are capable of destroying various targets owing to their high kinetic energy:

Nuclear devices which on exploding form a directed high-energy electromagnetic pulse. They are designed to knock out radioelectronic, radio communications, computers, and other equipment and to blind the enemy's system of early detection and warning of a nuclear missile attack for the purpose of ensuring a surprise strike against him; and thwarting or weakening a counterstrike against U.S. territory;

Nuclear devices that generate directed beams of high-energy particles (electrons, protons, neutral atoms);

Nuclear devices whose explosive energy is used to pump gamma lasers (grasers) and high-energy lasers operating in the visible wave band. The nature of their destructive effect on various targets is approximately the same as for x-ray lasers.

It is also an important fact that the design concepts of "third-generation" nuclear charge devices are verified precisely in the underground nuclear tests on the range in Nevada. At least 10 nuclear test explosions have already been carried out there for this purpose (as well as for the creation [sozdaniye] of x-ray laser).



It is precisely the U.S. ruling group's desire to fulfill at all costs the program for the development [razrabotka] of "third-generation" nuclear weapons designed for waging "star wars" that is the chief reason for its stubborn reluctance to subscribe to the Soviet moratorium on all nuclear explosions. By carrying out a 21 May the 11th officially announced explosion since the Soviet Union introduced its unilateral moratorium (and the 4th explosion this year), Washington once again demonstrated to the whole world its adherence to an unrestrained nuclear arms race.

Advocates of the "star wars" program claim that its nuclear aspects are on a "limited scale." At the same time, they maintain that the share of appropriations for research in the nuclear sphere in the overall SDI budget does not exceed 10-15 percent. However, the U.S. Energy Department plans first to spend \$605 million on work on creating [sozdaniye] nuclear devices alone under the "star wars" program in fiscal 1987 alone. That is more than twice the expenditure for this purpose planned for the current fiscal year. In addition, it is proposed to meet part of the expenditure on space nuclear means at the expense of the Pentagon, to which it is proposed to allocate \$4.8 billion for the SDI program in fiscal 1987. It is also planned to double the appropriations for conducting nuclear tests on the Nevada range. Second, according to the data of American specialists, the cost of nuclear weapons in the existing nuclear missile systems does not usually exceed 10 percent of the cost of their carriers and the backup technical facilities. Therefore, the fact that up to 15 percent of the total appropriations on the "star wars" program are being allocated to the nuclear aspects of this program certainly does not indicate any kind of "limited" nature of these aspects.

In an attempt to belittle the danger of deploying nuclear devices in space, champions of the "star wars" program also claim that these devices "can be ground-based" and will be launched into space, they say, "only if necessary." As even American specialists admit, this in no way lessens the danger of a nuclear conflict being unleashed.

As we see, the arguments being cited as proof of the "limited" scale of the nuclear aspects of SDI -- arguments designed to reduce the wave of mass actions against the militarization of space -- are false from beginning to end.

/9716

CSO: 5200/1406

## SDI AND SPACE ARMS

### SOVIET MAY-JUNE REPORTS ON U.S. DEBATE OVER SDI

#### Pressure on Congressmen

LD162224 Moscow TASS in English 1513 GMT 16 May 86

[Text] Washington, May 16 TASS--The Reagan administration is building up its pressure on U.S. congressmen to win their support for stepping up work to implement the space militarization programme. Speaking before members of a special arms control group of a U.S. House of Representatives subcommittee, Allen Holmes, assistant secretary of state, intimated that the administration would implement the "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI) aimed at developing strike space weapons, whatever the cost. He called on legislators to do their utmost to ensure full-scale financing of SDI programmes.

Despite the previous claims by U.S. leaders that the "space shield" would allegedly be "non-nuclear", the assistant state secretary put it flatly that the development of arms based on nuclear energy sources was an important sphere of explorations within the SDI framework. Resorting again to concoctions about a "Soviet military threat", A. Holmes intimated that the administration resolutely opposed any bill limiting work in this sphere. He used the same trick to substantiate the "need" for deploying the U.S. anti-satellite system (ASAT). On a moratorium on nuclear tests for which the USSR insistently calls on the USA, the State Department representative said at first that the complete and universal prohibition of nuclear tests remained the long-term aid of the USA, but added at once that the USA could not agree to the moratorium.

#### White House Confirms Intentions

LD232144 Moscow TASS in English 2125 GMT 23 May 86

[Text] Washington, May 23 TASS--The White House confirmed today that the United States intends to continue at a high pace the effort to implement the so-called Strategic Defence Initiative aimed at the creation of star wars armaments. The President's spokesman stated that the administration strongly disagrees with the 46 senators who demanded, in a letter to the head of the White House, a sharp cut in the appropriations for SDI. Expressing irritation over such a demand, the spokesman made it plain that the White House and the Pentagon expect the Congress to meet in the biggest possible volume the administration's request. The spokesman recalled that 4.8 billion dollars was asked for the Strategic Defence Initiative for the 1987 fiscal year.

## NASA 'Increasing Military Bias'

LD231027 Moscow TASS in English 0952 GMT 23 May 86

[Text] Washington, May 23 TASS--TASS correspondent Nikolay Turkatenko reports:

On Thursday the U.S. National Space Commission issued a report on U.S. resources in space research and on the main directions of space research in the coming fifty years. The publication of the report had been planned for the beginning of April but was postponed on the insistence of the White House in view of the work of the commission for inquiry into the circumstances of the space shuttle Challenger disaster.

The report paints a radiant picture according to which U.S. space shuttles will make journeys to Mars and back as early as the beginning of the 21st century. Like ocean liners they will have on board everything necessary for long space flights. The report maintains that they will be spacious enough to provide passengers with comfort for the period of long space travels. The report also has it that a space port will be created in a near-earth orbit as early as the end of the nineties of the current century, and that man will again land on the Moon by the year 2005.

Only the future will show whether such plans and possibilities are destined to come true. In the meantime it can be pointed out that many in the United States have long been assailed with growing doubts as to whether the country will be able to make rapid and successful headway in the most complex cause of space research and peaceful uses of outer space. U.S. space programmes have an increasing military bias, as a result of which NASA programmes aimed at using outer space for peaceful purposes shrink more and more. At present already a half of NASA programmes are intended to carry out the Pentagon's assignments.

The dominance of military departments in NASA programmes will also inevitably increase as the costly "Ostar wars" programme aimed at deploying strike weapon systems in outer space will get implemented. The Pentagon puts tough pressure on NASA, pressing for the maximum acceleration of the realisation of the planned military program. It is precisely this circumstance that is known to have resulted in the space shuttle Challenger disaster, because technical defects were overlooked owing to haste. In the opinion of U.S. specialists and the press, the space shuttle Challenger disaster threw U.S. space programmes several years backwards. In such situation the Pentagon will undoubtedly increase pressure on NASA for the purpose of making it speed up the work to a still greater extent, which may result in new disasters. The authors of the report obviously proceed from ideal conditions, without taking all these circumstances into account.

## Reagan 'Lies' in Funding Message

PM051116 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Jun 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Above an Abyss in Lies. Reagan's Message to Congress on the Military Budget"]

[Text] Washington, 4 Jun -- The U.S. Administration has embarked on a new round of twisting the arms of U.S. legislators. President Reagan has sent Congress a message demanding full support for the administration's budget request for fiscal 1987 to implement America's "strategic modernization" programs, including the "Strategic Defense Initiative." The administration demanded that Congress appropriate the unprecedented sum of \$320 billion for these programs.

During the preliminary vote in Congress, as is known, the Senate cut the administration's request to \$301 billion, and the House of Representative to \$285 billion. However, as the message shows, the administration does not intend to reconcile itself even to such insignificant cuts in relation to the sum total of military spending requested.

In order to push the demands for the Pentagon's requests to be met in full through the House-Senate Conference Committee and then through Congress as a whole, the White House has once again resorted to shameless juggling with facts and to overt lies.

Lie number one. It has long been well known to everyone that the United States itself has been the initiator of the arms race ever since the short-lived U.S. monopoly of atomic weapons. But the message claims that the United States is implementing the "strategic modernization" program because it is allegedly lagging behind the Soviet Union in terms of many parameters of the military arsenal. In fact, Washington is obsessed by a desire to achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union and to get its hands on a potential to inflict a preemptive first strike, as indicated both by the buildup of strategic offensive arms on the earth and by the accelerated development [razrabotka] of space arms systems under the "star wars" program.

Lie number two. The President's message expresses the administration's firm determination to implement at an accelerated pace both the "star wars" program and all other military programs, and all this is proclaimed as..."ensuring greater security for the world."

Lie number three. Those people in the United States who advocate slowing down the rate of increase in military spending are virtually branded as enemies of America. "Every dollar deducted from our strategic programs," the message states, "is a victory for a potential aggressor. Each reduction and delay weakens our position at Geneva."

In the opinion of a number of observers here, such false claims and accusations long ago became irksome to many legislators. This is indicated, in particular, by the fact that on the day the President's message was published, 46 senators of both the Democratic and the Republican Parties confirmed their resolute opposition to the "star wars" program and demanded a sharp cut in the appropriations on its implementation.

# Abrahamson Seeks More Funding

LD050612 Moscow TASS in English 0459 GMT 5 Jun 86

[Text] Washington June 5 TASS -- The U.S. Administration would not give up its attempts to mislead public opinion about the "star wars" programme. This is illustrated by a statement made by the SDI Chief, General Abrahamson, to the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives. He said that the fulfilment of SDI would contribute to stability in relations among countries and strengthen security. Arguing for larger appropriations for his organization, the general again invoked the "Soviet military threat" myth and portrayed the "star wars" programme as a means of countering "aggression." Abrahamson made it clear that the appropriations were needed to speed up work on all the components of the partially space-based ABM system, including strike systems.

/9716

CSO: 5200/1406

## SDI AND SPACE ARMS

### JAPAN MOVING TOWARD SDI INVOLVEMENT

PM211820 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Apr 86 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent Yu. Vdovin dispatch under the general heading: "Washington Steps Up Pressure on Tokyo"]

[Text] Tokyo, 14 Apr--A third delegation of experts from leading companies and high-ranking leaders of a number of ministries has returned to Japan from a trip around the United States. Its task was to fully establish the prospects for Japanese participation in the American "star wars" program. The delegation will submit its recommendations to the Government in the next few days.

Tokyo officialdom is still pretending that it has not yet finally determined its attitude to Washington's venture. However, much evidence has already accumulated indicating that the Japanese Government is ready to play an active part in SDI. It only remains to be stated what form this will take, whether it will be at the level of government or private companies.

Having expressed at the beginning of last year his "understanding and support" for the "Strategic Defense Initiative," Prime Minister Y. Nakasone has spent all this time preparing public opinion to swallow the bitter pill of Japanese involvement in this dangerous American venture. The preparation was needed to circumvent the constitutional provisions which repudiate war and armaments, Japan's three nonnuclear principles--to which the premier has repeatedly sworn his devotion in public--and parliamentary resolutions limiting space research and exploration to peaceful purposes only and prohibiting the export of weapons and military technology.

With each day that passes members of the Government here have made increasingly clear references in their speeches to the fact that all these restrictions may be sacrificed to the military alliance with the United States, "to strengthening solidarity with the West," to participation in "technological progress," and so forth. The three Japanese delegations' trips to the United States were specifically designed to determine the forms and scale of SDI participation most favorable to Japan. The question is not a simple one, since in certain spheres Japan possesses as much scientific research and technological potential capable of being used in SDI as the United States. It is no secret that the Japanese monopolies would like to obtain certain guarantees that their interests will be taken account of when the orders are shared out.

But even after the pill has been sweetened by several months of government efforts and promises of various kinds of "advantages," involvement in "star wars" still causes the Japanese public grave concern. Misgivings about the wisdom of such a move are even being voiced in the ruling circles. The democratic forces and the press warn that this step could have the most serious consequences. Participation in SDI, according to MAINICHI, may lead to increasing pressure on the part of the United States to make Japan accept even greater military commitments.

/9716

CSO: 5200/1406

## SDI AND SPACE ARMS

### FRENCH 'COHABITATION' SHOWING STRAINS OVER SDI

LD312104 Moscow in French to France and Belgium 1730 GMT 31 May 86

[Boris Tumanov commentary]

[Text] Good evening, dear listeners. The disadvantages of cohabitation were evident recently, but this time in an area which goes far beyond the context of strictly French national problems. This time it is a matter of France's position with regard to the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative about which the French prime minister and president have expressed different points of view.

As everyone knows, Chirac lavished praise on SDI when he addressed the members of the French Diplomatic Press Association, and he declared, among other things, that he would not allow France to stay outside the great inevitable, irreversible and justified movement of the initiative in question. For him France cannot stay outside this great research work.

The word research here seems to be a formal clause, given that the French prime minister already approves of star wars on the military level, as he said.

As for President Mitterrand, he on the other hand asserted that his country would never take part in the U.S. plan for the militarization of space, nor would it allow itself to be dragged into a conflict in which it does not intend to take part. Speaking to students of the military school at Coetquidan, the president confirmed -- to use his own words -- the permanent doctrine, which has existed for nearly a quarter of a century now, and which must be kept.

He meant the doctrine of the autonomy of French defense, which goes back to the De Gaulle era.

So we are faced with a rather disconcerting fact: There are two different allegiances in the upper spheres of France on the subject of an important, or even vital, question -- vital not just for France and its future, but for all mankind. It would be naive to believe that for France to adopt the idea of star wars would just mean a change in military doctrine, for the militarization of space, envisaged by Washington, would create such a destabilization in world security that no military doctrine in the world could reestablish the balance of power that exists at the current time.



Those pushing SDI stress the irreversible nature of technological progress, as if the existence of this worldwide phenomenon could of itself justify an endless arms race. Of course, you cannot stop progress -- I am far from proposing the destruction of machines or preaching a return to the stone age. But man must not become the slave, nor even less the hostage, of his own inventions. The implementation of SDI would inevitably give rise to the creation of countermeasures, which, in turn, would provoke the appearance of other initiatives quite as mad, as the moon war or galactic war type. Where would it all end? In the yawning emptiness of a war that would leave no one on our earth. Do you not think, dear listeners, that that is too high a price to pay for the admiration of some for technological progress? We no longer live in the age of the Marne taxis, or of the Maginot Line, for heaven's sake! Hundreds of mini-atomic reactors, powerful laser guns suspended permanently above our heads is not like 1914. Come on, there is not much harmless tradition there, is there?

I am not speaking about all this to make a point about the difficulties of the current authorities in France, nor to give you my opinion about [word indistinct] which you have known for a long time. I am just asking you: If some French people voted for the present majority, does this mean automatically that they voted for the militarization of space? I should not think so. I should not think so at all, and first and foremost because I know that the French are not in the habit of picking up crumbs from other people's tables, even from the table of their great ally and benefactor.

/9716

CSO: 5200/1406

## U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

### UK GROUP IN USSR DISCUSSES GORBACHEV ARMS CUTS PROPOSAL

#### Delegation Members

LD232035 Moscow TASS in English 2012 GMT 23 May 86

[Text] Moscow May 23 TASS -- A delegation of the British Parliament today arrived in Moscow for an official visit at the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet. The delegation is headed by Deputy Prime Minister, Lord President of the Privy Council, member of the Conservative Party Viscount Whitelaw.

On the delegation are Shadow Foreign Secretary, Labourite Denis Healey; Chairman of the British Group of the Inter-Parliamentary Union, Conservative David Crouch; deputy leader of the opposition in the House of Lords, Labourite Lord Underhill; Deputy Chairman of the British-Soviet group of the House of Commons, Chairman of the select committee on social service, Labourite Rene Short; deputy leader of the Liberal Party and the party's spokesman on foreign affairs Alan Beith; member of the Conservative party Peter Temple-Morris; Chairman of the British-Soviet group of the House of Commons, Chairman of the Select Committee on Trade and Industry, Conservative Kenneth Warren; Secretary of the British-Soviet group of the House of Commons, Labourite James Lamond; Labourite Martin Flannery; member of the Executive Committee of the British group of the Inter-Parliamentary Union, Conservative Roger Sims; Chairman of the Parliamentary Labour Party Foreign And Commonwealth Committee, Labourite Tom Clarke; Conservative Robert Jackson; private parliamentary secretary to minister of state for foreign affairs, Conservative Tony Baldry.

The delegation was met at the airport by chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet Avgust Voss, deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet Georgiy Arbatov, Vladimir Terebilov, other officials.

Great Britain's Ambassador to the USSR Bryan George Cartledge was among the welcoming party.

### Meeting With Gorbachev

LD261744 Moscow TASS in English 1731 GMT 26 May 86

[Text] Moscow May 26 TASS -- On May 26 Mikhail Gorbachev received in the Kremlin a British parliamentary delegation led by Lord Whitelaw and including representatives of all the parliamentary parties, among them the Labour "shadow" foreign secretary, Denis Healey.

Lord Whitelaw handed Mikhail Gorbachev a personal message from British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher.

In the course of a frank and friendly conversation, the sides presented their positions on a broad range of outstanding problems of the international situation and relations between the USSR and Britain.

### Talks With Voss

LD271634 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1525 GMT 27 May 86

[Text] Moscow, 27 May (TASS) -- A meeting took place today in the USSR Supreme Soviet with the British parliamentary delegation led by Lord Whitelaw, lord president of the council

Avzug Voss, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet, told the guests about basic trends in the social, economic, public, and political life of Soviet society at the current stage, and spoke about the activity and structure of the country's supreme organ of state power.

We greatly appreciated the opportunity to meet with Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and are deeply grateful to him for the time he gave us and for the exchange of opinions which took place, the head of the delegation said.

David Crouch, Renee Short, Robert Jackson, Tom Clarke, and Alan Beith, the delegation members, spoke about various aspects of the British Parliament's activity.

During the conversation, great attention was paid to the theme of international security and disarmament. Despite differing approaches to several issues concerning this problem of paramount importance to humanity, both sides agreed on the need for an end to the arms race.

The British MP's explained the various points of view of the parties which they represent on domestic and foreign policy issues. It was stated in particular that the Labour Party opposes British participation in the American SDI program, including its research section, and opposes the deployment of U.S. cruise missiles in the country. D. Healey described as a new and valuable initiative the proposal expressed by Mikhail Gorbachev during his meeting with the delegation that if Great Britain officially decides to eliminate its own nuclear weapons, the Soviet Union will be prepared to reduce its nuclear potential correspondingly.

The participants in the talks remarked that the exchange of opinions that took place made a positive contribution to the development of Soviet-British parliamentary links.

Taking part in the talks were deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet Georgiy Arbatov, Vadim Zagladin, Yuriy Izrael, Sergey Losev, and Vladimir Terebilov.

Lunch was provided in honor of the delegation on behalf of the chairmen of the chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The British members of Parliament visited the mausoleum of V.I. Lenin.

#### Whitelaw Comments

LD271753 Moscow World Service in English 1550 GMT 27 May 86

[Interview with UK parliamentary delegation leader Lord Whitelaw by Aleksandr Barabeychik in Moscow on 26 May; from the "Guest Speaker" program--recorded]

[Excerpt] Barabeychik] Lord Whitelaw, you have just been received by General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev in the Kremlin. How would you describe the meeting, what did you learn about the Soviet stand on major international problems?

[Whitelaw] The meeting was long and very friendly and conducted in a good spirit throughout. We discussed both those issues on which we agreed and those issues on which we differed, I think, in a very friendly spirit.

[Barabeychik] During the meeting did you feel the Soviet leader's concern for the present tense international situation?

[Whitelaw] Yes, indeed. They feel that they have made various proposals, they don't feel that in all cases they've had a sufficient response from the West. Obviously that's a matter on which we might argue but that is their feeling.

[Barabeychik] What remedies does he suggest for rectifying it to the better?

[Whitelaw] I think that Mr Gorbachev is very keen to have a summit meeting but he wants to be sure before he has such a meeting that there are positive areas where the groundwork has been done leading to an agreement.

[Barabeychik] Did Comrade Gorbachev familiarize you with the major Soviet peace initiative of 15 January?

[Whitelaw] Yes, indeed he did, and he hopes that that will be followed up and he feels that so far it hasn't been followed up as much as he would have liked.

[Barabeychik] Mikhail Gorbachev also dwelt on Soviet-British relations. What points did he make, how does he see the priorities here?

[Whitelaw] Well, he was grateful for the prime minister's letter. He said that it showed that the British Government wished to continue the dialogue. He hoped that that would be further developed. He would reply to it. He had some reservations as to the extent with which we had reacted to various events but on the whole he clearly wanted an improvement in British relations and he wanted to see the Soviet Union and Britain closer together on many of these issues. And that was the whole burden of a meeting which went on for so long, was conducted in such a friendly spirit. It showed the feeling that everyone wanted to make progress.

[Barabeychik] General Secretary Gorbachev's approach to subjects of your discussion, did it reveal new political concepts, new political thinking so vital in our nuclear age?

[Whitelaw] He had various proposals to make about the future of nuclear weapons, about a comprehensive test ban treaty which he wants to put to the other nations, and no doubt that will be done.

#### Arms Deal Ruled Out

LD271803 London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English 1783 GMT 27 May 86

[By Chris Moncrieff, PA chief political correspondent]

[Text] Liberal Party Deputy Leader Mr Alan Beith, in Moscow with a group of British parliamentarians, today ruled out "deals on the side" between Britain and the Soviet Union as a means of reducing international tension over nuclear weapons.

Mr Beith was speaking after the all-party group had talks at the Kremlin with Mr Mikhail Gorbachev, in which the Soviet leader said Moscow was ready to strike a separate agreement with Britain on cutting nuclear weapons.

But Mr Beith said afterwards: "The answer to problems of international tension does not lie in deals on the side between Britain and the Soviet Union.

"Britain's role should lie in helping to bring about a more constructive response from the United States and in ceasing to back such U.S. policies as star wars."

Mr. Beith went on: "Mr Gorbachev is in a strong position to achieve a reduction in arms spending, which the Soviet economy badly needs, as part of an agreement which could safeguard the interests of the Western democracies and make the world a safer place.

"We made it absolutely clear that he is very keen to secure real progress in multilateral disarmament, and, although all the options he has put forward will require considerable further work, Western leaders will be very foolish if they do not show a positive response.

Mr Beith said. "Mr Gorbachev referred to the need to build a bridge from both sides. Mrs Thatcher needs to push the Americans into doing more bridge-building instead of encouraging them to carry on as before."

Mr Beith handed to Mr Gorbachev a letter from Mr David Steel in which the Liberal leader called for an improvement in "the controlled management of our differences".

Mr Steel's letter continued: "Irrespective of the United States action in Libya, from which we strongly dissented, or their failure to respond to the ban on test. [as received] which you offered and have now extended, it is essential that the Geneva process be taken forward.

"My own view is that the freeze option, which you have proposed, would represent a significant step forward. Quite evidently it is not a policy in itself, but it would greatly improve the possibility of longer-term agreement in terms which both the Soviet Union and the Western alliance would regard as providing security and stability."

#### Labour MP Lamond Interviewed

LD301859 Moscow World Service in English 1550 GMT 30 May 86

[From the "Guest Speaker" program, presented by Aleksandr Barabeychik]

[Text] [Barabeychik] Our guest today is James Lamond, a Labour Party MP who is on the list of the British Parliamentary delegation touring at present in the Soviet Union. The British delegation was received in the Kremlin by General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev. James Lamond had a few words of comment on this meeting:

[Begin recording] [Lamond] We had a very good meeting in the Kremlin with Mr Gorbachev. The whole delegation, all 14 of us, were present, and we were able to discuss the situation between our two countries; the very strong need for building bridges. But, as Mr Gorbachev said, a bridge cannot be built from one side only, and he outlined the proposals which the Soviet Union had made which are familiar to people through the speeches he has made, and he asked us to try and encourage our government and people to respond to the positive proposals. And we had an exchange of opinion about the response that we made to the very concrete proposals he had laid down on 15th January, in which Britain is involved to a small extent in as much as they [as heard] should not further develop their nuclear weapons, which of course means that we shouldn't go ahead with the Trident missiles purchases. And that seems to me to be quite sensible because if the two superpowers are struggling to try and establish some level, some end to the arms race, for others including ourselves and France, to continue building our arms and developing and improving them would be counterproductive and quite contrary to the spirit of the negotiations between the superpowers. And it was on matters of this kind that we discussed for, as I say, about 2 hours. So it was, in my opinion, a very fruitful meeting. The delegation certainly felt that they had been honored and we will be making reports back of course, in my case all over the country because I have a string of meetings arranged for describing to interested peace activists what went on here. I shall go back refreshed and determined to carry on the struggle in my own country for peace.

[Barabeychik] Now, the center of gravity of Soviet foreign policy has always been the attainment of a situation when there is no nuclear armaments left on our globe, and in most clear cut and precise form this aspiration to that goal was expressed in 15th January statement by General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev, to abolish in three stages by the end of our millennium all nuclear weapons. Can you specify your stance on this document?

[Lamond] Well, of course, I support the document very strongly. I think it was one of the most positive, concrete proposals which had made before the whole world for many many years. And it lays the path open and clear towards that goal which I hope all politicians in all countries will share, because a world without nuclear weapons would certainly be a wonderful world, much safer than the one we have today. Of course, there have been responses from the West and I regret to say in the main negative responses, in particular in my own country where we play some part in the program towards nuclear, complete nuclear disarmament. It has been, the suggestion has been, rejected -- the suggestion that is that we should not improve our nuclear weapons in the meantime, because Mrs Thatcher has agreed again and again with the Americans that she should go ahead with the purchase of Trident missiles. So, I support the plan, and many many people in Britain also support it, including many members of Parliament. But there is a lot of work still to be done in our country before we can convince our leaders, our present leaders, that they should participate fully in this plan.

[Barabeychik] After the Chernobyl mishap the USSR once again deemed it necessary to extend its unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions till 6th August, in an attempt to move the problem of nuclear testing away from the blind alley, and this is a very grave step on our side. [sentence as heard] Was it welcomed in the British Labour Party?

[Lamond] It was welcomed very much indeed, and we have been emphasizing again in our Parliament and at the meetings I have spoken at in connection with the International Year of Peace, by the time the 6th August comes round that will be 1 year in which the moratorium, the unilateral moratorium, has stood. And I feel that the Americans should respond to that. In particular, you yourself mentioned the incident at Chernobyl. I think this has brought home to people exactly the danger, not only from the explosions themselves -- because there must be some danger from that -- but from what a nuclear war would really mean. Because if an incident, a very serious incident but nevertheless a minor incident in comparison to what would happen in, let us say, a nuclear strike of any kind, a deliberate nuclear explosion in the atmosphere, a strike against the Soviet Union for example, would not affect only the Soviet Union but would have its very serious effects throughout the whole of Western Europe and perhaps the world. So, it has focussed people's attention to this matter and made the proposal by the Soviet Government all the more acceptable in the West, I think.  
[end recording]

[Barabeychik] I was talking today with James Lamond, a Labour MP who is now touring the Soviet Union with the British parliamentary delegation.

Received by Gromyko

LD021803 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 2 Jun 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Today in the Kremlin Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko received a British parliamentary delegation headed by Lord Whitelaw. The British parliamentarians' attention was drawn to the Soviet peace initiatives, the concept of universal security that was put forward at the 27th CPSU Congress, the program for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons before the end of the 20th century and the moratorium on nuclear tests up to 6 August of this year that the Soviet Union has announced unilaterally. These proposals meet the most treasured aspirations of the peoples in questions of war and peace, and in fact, in questions of life and death for all mankind.

Comrade Gromyko stressed that the actions of the U.S. Administration are directed towards undermining a Soviet-U.S. dialogue. President Reagan's intention to refuse to observe the provisions of the treaty on limiting strategic offensive armaments shows that he is continuing a policy that is not directed toward preventing a nuclear war.

Both sides expressed satisfaction with the positive moves towards bilateral cooperation that have been noted of late.

Lord Whitelaw expressed warm gratitude for the cordial welcome that had been given to the parliamentary delegation from Great Britain.

#### Discuss Disarmament

LD021812 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1730 GMT 2 Jun 86

[Text] A conversation between Andrey Gromyko, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the British parliamentary delegation, which is completing its visit to the USSR, took place in the Kremlin today.

The British parliamentarians attention was drawn to the Soviet peace initiatives and, in particular, to the proposals concerning nuclear disarmament that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev addressed to the Government of Great Britain. In response to this, the delegation's members described their great interest in these proposals. From their viewpoint, the Soviet leader's important proposals ought to be examined in London.

The chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium stated that it was necessary to achieve the implementation of the decisions jointly agreed upon that are aimed at consolidating peace and lowering the level of military confrontation in Europe. Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko described the activities of the highest bodies of state power in our country and, while responding to specific questions, dwelt on certain other foreign policy problems.



## Talks Continue

LD021955 Moscow TASS in English 1950 GMT 2 Jun 86

[Text] Moscow June 6 TASS -- [dateline as received] British deputy prime minister, lord-president of the Privy Council, member of the Conservative Party, leader of the British parliamentary delegation Viscount Whitelaw said that the British MPs had been strongly impressed by great attention paid in the Soviet Union to the young generation and to cultural development.

This was said at the opening of the conversation in the Kremlin between member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet Andrey Gromyko and the British parliamentary delegation that is concluding its official visit to the Soviet Union.

Andrey Gromyko said that since the times Lenin was at the helm of the state, Soviet power has been paying the closest of attention to the education of youth. This has always been so, and this state of affairs continues. For instance, the latest meeting of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet discussed the work in the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic to observe the demands of the legislation for the consolidation of the family and enhancement of its responsibility for the upbringing of children.

At the same time, the state is doing everything to ensure that the masses of the people should have the opportunity to familiarize themselves with the cultural heritage of mankind. This helps educate the man who believes in the victory of reason over ignorance. All the measures aimed the molding of such man are imbued with ideas of peace and friendship among nations, of the need for averting the threat of nuclear catastrophe.

In reply to a statement of the British parliamentarians that they declare for mutual understanding between the two countries, Andrey Gromyko said that this is a very valuable remark, and that the Soviet side goes along with it.

During the conversation, the attention of the British parliamentarians was called to the Soviet peace initiatives of historic importance: the programme of the complete elimination of nuclear weapons before the end of the 20th century, advanced in Mikhail Gorbachev's statement of January 15, 1986 and confirmed by the 27th CPSU Congress, the concept of universal security set out in the Political Report to the congress, the moratorium on nuclear testing that the Soviet Union announced unilaterally and that will be operating till August 6 of this year, the Soviet Union's readiness to start without delay any talks on a complete ban on nuclear weapon tests. These proposals meet the aspirations of peoples in questions of war and peace.

"Those who heap up nuclear arms are generating danger, not security", Andrey Gromyko said. "Moreover, they aggravate this danger to the utmost. This must not be forgotten by anyone ever".

"The Soviet Union is guided by deeply humane considerations when proclaiming the need for the elimination of nuclear arms", Andrey Gromyko said. "The main thing for which we call is to realize the tremendousness of this task, for without solving it all of us, that is, all countries, large and small, all peoples, will be as if looking down an abyss, facing the threat to fall into it".

One of the leaders of the opposition in the British parliament, member of the Labour Party, Denis Healey said that a few days had passed since the delegation's conversation with Mikhail Gorbachev. Prospects of a Soviet-U.S. summit were discussed during that conversation. But two important events took place since that time. The first of those events was that the United States opposed the entire international community in Berne at a conference on human contacts and thus frustrated the adoption of a final document. The second event was that President Reagan proclaimed the intention to give up this year the observance of the provisions of the treaty on the limitation of strategic offensive arms (SALT-2). In the opinion of the British MP, the prospects for a Soviet-U.S. dialogue cannot be viewed as promising in these conditions.

Gromyko noticed that such actions by the U.S. Administration resemble the planting of a high-explosive bomb under the SALT-2 treaty. Only those act this way who are not interested in averting a nuclear war, who feverishly pursue a dangerous policy aimed at continued production of nuclear armaments and outer space militarization. But the British Parliament could say its weighty word in support of the treaty. But it has not said it as yet.

The Soviet side furthermore stressed the importance of those proposals on nuclear disarmament, which were put forward by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev in the talk with the British MPs and were addressed to the British Government. In reply to this, the members of the delegation said what great interest those proposals evoked among them. They believe that the important proposals of the Soviet leader should be discussed in London.

The President of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet said that the peoples throughout the world await practical steps on the part of governments, first and foremost, the governments of major countries. It is necessary that agreed decisions aimed at consolidating peace and reducing the level of military confrontation in Europe be put into effect. The Soviet Union will patiently and purposefully pursue the course of stepping up international cooperation and reaching agreements on important and acute international problems.

Alan Beith, deputy leader of the Liberal Party, said that he was greatly impressed by the fact that the 27th CPSU Congress paid much attention to youth as an important force in developing society. Deputies of the British Parliament, including David Crouch, Rene Short and Kenneth Warren put a number of questions pertaining to the Soviet Union's domestic and foreign policies, the activity of the USSR Supreme Soviet and its Presidium.

Gromyko answered all questions, told the British MPs about the activity of the higher bodies of state authority of our country, and in answering the respective questions, touched upon some other foreign policy problems. He underlined the role of the Soviet and British MPs who can and, in our view, should make a tangible contribution towards building confidence and developing mutually beneficial relations between the Soviet Union and Britain.

On behalf of the entire delegation, Viscount Whitelaw thanked the Soviet leadership and Soviet people for the cordial reception in the USSR.

Taking part in the talk from the Soviet side were - Avgust Voss, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Tengiz Menteshashvili, secretary of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Vasily Kazakov, Sergey Losev and Vladimir Terebilov -- deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Anatoliy Kovalyov, first deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, Nikolay Rubstov, head of the Secretariat of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and Vladimir Suslov, head of the Second European Department of the USSR Foreign Ministry; from the British side -- Bryan George Cartledge, British ambassador to the USSR.

The British MPs visited V.I. Lenin's study and living rooms in the Kremlin, now a museum.

In the evening, the delegation left for homeland. It was staying in the Soviet Union on an official visit at the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

#### Dobrynin Receives Healey

LD021813 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 2 Jun 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Comrade Dobrynin today received Healey, the UK Labour Party's shadow foreign secretary, who has been in Moscow as part of the UK parliamentary delegation. An exchange of opinions was held on problems of disarmament, as well as questions of bilateral relations between the CPSU and the British Labour Party.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1412

## SALT/START ISSUES

USSR: 4 JUNE PRESS CONFERENCE ON REAGAN SALT II DECISION

### PRAVDA Report

PM051058 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Jun 86 First Edition p 4

["At the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center"--PRAVDA headline]

[Text] A press conference for Soviet and foreign journalists was held at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center on 4 June. Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev, first deputy defense minister and chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff; and A.A. Bessmertnykh, USSR deputy foreign minister, participated in the press conference.

The following statement was read at the press conference: A few days ago the U.S. Administration took an action aimed at whipping up the arms race. President Reagan announced that in the future the United States will refuse to observe the 1972 Interim Agreement Limiting Offensive Strategic Arms [SALT I] and the 1979 SALT II agreement. This means that the incumbent U.S. leadership has embarked on a unilateral renunciation of commitments under the most important documents in international law, which the USSR and the United States have observed on a reciprocal basis. The step in question is a logical culmination of Washington's policy regarding SALT II, which began with the refusal to ratify the agreement.

An attempt has essentially been made to wreck the military parity between the USSR and the United States that is the basis for strategic stability in the world and to remove the existing material restrictions on the arms race. These actions are fraught with serious consequences for international security.

They have been condemned worldwide. Clearly realizing that the announced course runs counter to the fundamental interests of people, including the American people, leading figures in the U.S. Administration would like to obscure as far as possible the essence and purport of what they have done. To that end they are resorting to distortion of the true state of affairs, juggling with figures, and substituting concepts. The full force of the political disinformation machine has been brought into play.

However, the White House scenario, concocted to justify the motives and the underlying cause behind the measures being taken to destroy the foundation of the arms limitation and reduction process, does not stand up to comparison with the real facts.

Fact one. The United States, contrary to Washington's assertions, has in recent years done nothing aimed at promoting an "atmosphere of mutual restraint" in the strategic offensive arms limitation sphere. The present administration has not reduced or even downgraded [skorrektyrovana v storonu organicheniya] a single arms program. On the contrary, in peacetime a comprehensive program has been worked out and set in motion for building powerful arms in all components of the U.S. strategic triad -- new ICBM's, new missile submarines, new bombers, and cruise missiles in all launch modalities. Essentially all the programs shelved by previous administrations for one reason or another have been reanimated. What kind of restraint can we be talking about when even World War II battleships are "demothballed" and reequipped as nuclear weapon platforms?

The United States has embarked on the implementation of the "star wars" program and the creation of space-strike arms. Now it wants to give a space dimension to the arms race. The United States has prepared for the production of new mass destruction weapons -- chemical binary weapons. Nor does the administration's stubborn reluctance to join in the existing Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions attest to restraint. In no way does Washington want to eschew nuclear explosions, which are carried out in order to create new types of weapons, including space weapons.

Fact two. It is not the Soviet Union, as the White House claims, but the United States that refuses to conduct serious talks in the arms limitation and reduction sphere.

The Soviet Union has put forward an integrated program for eliminating nuclear, chemical and other types of mass destruction weapons in the world. It has submitted proposals for conventional arms and armed forces reductions. At the talks on nuclear and space arms the USSR has proposed specific measures for implementing the first phase of a nuclear disarmament program -- agreeing to radical, 50 percent reductions in the relevant nuclear arms of the USSR and the United States and eliminating all Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in the European zone.

Has the United States made any new proposals at the talks recently? No, not a single new proposal has emerged from the United States.

Fact three. U.S. representatives, including the President, try to justify the decision to drop the interim agreement and SALT II by citing "Soviet violations" of these documents. They cite the appearance in the USSR of an alleged second new type of ICBM ICBM -- the SS-25 -- and the "excessive encryption" of telemetry information during missile test launches. In this context the construction of a radar station in Krasnoyarsk is also mentioned, although, let us note in passing, this radar station has nothing to do with SALT II.

There is no substantial foundation for any of these claims. The Soviet side has demonstrated more than once, on the basis of concrete data, that the United States is deliberately distorting facts and is diverting attention from its own violations of treaties and agreements. The more it talks about Soviet "violations" the more obvious this truth becomes.

Fact four. By renouncing observance of SALT I and SALT II, the U.S. Administration would also like to gain some political capital. While giving the impression that they will "technically" observe SALT II for another few months (until MIRVed strategic delivery vehicles exceed the limit of 1,320 units as a result of the deployment of bombers with cruise missiles), the Americans are declaring that they will, you see, observe the Soviet side's behavior throughout this period and "take it into account."

It is absurd to adopt this approach in any event, and especially now. Violators of treaties do not have the right to pose as their guardian. Moreover, you must not proclaim a treaty and an agreement "dead" and, at the same time, observe the, even "technically."

Washington's current course can be summed up as follows: If some U.S. military program conflicts with the existing treaty restrictions, the agreement will be discarded. Arms get priority. While basically doing nothing to achieve new accords in the arms limitation sphere, the United States is breaking the treaties and agreements that have already been achieved.

This approach will do Washington no good either from the viewpoint of strengthening U.S. security or from the viewpoint of Soviet-U.S. relations or the development of the world situation as a whole.

As the Soviet Government statement says, the United States will not manage to acquire military advantages for itself at the expense of others' security. The Soviet Union will take the necessary practical steps to prevent strategic military parity from being undermined. The U.S. side should have no illusions on the score.

Answers were then to journalists' questions.

#### IZVESTIYA Report

PM051538 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Jun 86 Morning Edition p 4

[Melor Sturua report: "Exposure of Lies. In the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center"]

[Excerpts] Externally, everything looked at it did a few days ago. The same scene of action -- No 4 Zubovskiy Boulevard. The USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center. The same leading actors -- Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev, USSR first deputy defense minister and chief of General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, and A.A. Bessmertnykh, USSR deputy foreign minister. The same subject was discussed -- the situation concerning the SALT I and SALT II agreements. Yes, externally everything looked as it did a few days ago. But only externally. Between 23 May, the date of the first press conference, and 4 June, the date of the second, a third date was crudely sandwiched -- 27 May. On that day, which will no doubt go down as a black page in the history of international relations, U.S. President Ronald Reagan made a statement that the future the United States will refuse to observe the Soviet-U.S. legal treaty documents on the limitation of strategic offensive weapons. Something against which the Soviet Union has issued repeated warnings has happened.

...The curtain parted at about 1200 hours to reveal before the journalist who had assembled a graph chart of the basic limitation parameters of SALT I and SALT II. The same thing more or less happened a few days before. And yet, it was not quite the same. An alarming reminder of this was provided by a curt notice on the graph. It read: "All limitations lose their effect upon U.S. withdrawal from the SALT I and SALT II accords." In my report on the first press conference, I compared the graph with a cage in which the nuclear missile arms race was locked, as it were. I wrote that the Pentagon predator intends to break out of that cage. Even at that time the bars of this symbolic cage appeared thoroughly bent, and even sawn through here and there. Following the 27 May presidential statement, the cage is, for all intents and purpose, empty.

Recalling the essence of the U.S. President's statement and the subsequent Soviet Government statement, and seeing the curtain, that until then was covering the graph, being drawn aside, I thought: The opening of this symbolic curtain seems to mark the beginning of a new drama whose transatlantic producers have decided to disrupt military-strategic parity and gain advantage over us.

I spoke earlier about the external similarity between the two press conferences. In one respect, however, they were totally dissimilar. In the first instance, not a single one of the U.S. journalists representing bourgeois news media at the press conference asked a single question of strategic arms limitation. This time there were more than enough of them. Reporters from NATO countries displayed equal "curiosity." It was no accident that the "dumb" began to speak. The anxiety caused by Washington's adventurist step loosened their tongues. Let us recall the outcome of the NATO meeting in the Canadian city of Halifax, where even the most loyal U.S. allies openly expressed their disagreement with Washington's provocative step. (Maybe the city's name -- Halifax -- reminded some people of British diplomat Lord Halifax, and his shadow, in its turn, about the policy of appeasement and its catastrophic consequences.) Be that as it may, there was a multitude of questions....

The time for the question and answer session came. Most questions dealt with the exposure of Washington's attempt to shift blame from the guilty to the innocent to "justify" its own aggressive plans and schemes.

Question: What effect will Reagan's decision on U.S. nonobservance of the SALT agreements have on the talks on nuclear space weapons?

Answer: Definitely negative.

Taking into account the interconnection of the questions being discussed and resolved in Geneva, it is easy to foresee that an acute complication of the state of affairs in the strategic weapons group cannot fail to affect the overall situation at the talks.

Question: President Reagan says the United States will "display restraint" in the development [razvitiye] of its strategic offensive weapons. Is the USSR prepared to reciprocate?

Answer: Instead of a treaty drawn up on the basis of the principle of equality and identical security, the U.S. President is promising not to deploy more "strategic nuclear delivery systems" and "strategic ballistic missile warheads" -- that is, warheads on ICBM's and SLBM's only -- than the USSR.

As you can see, the U.S. President is not talking at all about equality in heavy bombers and ALCM's. He wants to have at least a triple advantage in them, without allowing the Soviet Union the right to compensate for them with ballistic missiles, which are our main strategic deterrent. Nor does he talk about SLCM's, of which the United States plans to have several thousand. He is also silent about his medium-range missiles in Europe, which are strategic weapons with regard to the USSR.

One wonders what kind of restraint we can be talking about if it is proposed that we do not increase the number of our arms but the U.S. side would increase its number by many thousands of units.

Question from an IZVESTIYA correspondent: President R. Reagan's statement again points out that the SS-25 missile, as the RS-12M missile is called in the West, is a second new type of ICBM banned under the SALT II Agreement. Is that so? If not, why is it so persistently repeated?

Answer: The Soviet Union has tested only one new type of ICBM -- the RS-22.

When they refer to the testing of a second new type of ICBM in the Soviet Union, the Americans have in mind the RS-12M missile which is a modernization of our old ICBM, the RS-12. This kind of modernization is not prohibited and was carried out in strict compliance with the provisions of the agreement.

In the United States the clear provision of the SALT II agreement on the list of elements which make up the so-called "throw weight" of a missile was deliberately distorted. At variance with this provision the weight of certain elements which make up the throw weight of the old missile (RS-12) (means to overcome ABM defense and the warhead guidance device) is not included, while on the other hand, the weight of equipment used only during testing is illegitimately included in the throw weight of the modernized ICBM (the RS-12M).

The aim is obvious. The United States already has one new type of ICBM (the MX missile). Now it is creating [sozdayut] another new type of ICBM (the Midgetman), which is at variance with the treaty. Hence stem the attempts to gain some kind of "right" to a second new type of ICBM and at the same time to slander the USSR as a partner in talks and to prepare the ground for the renunciation of the obligation to observe treaty provisions in the sphere of strategic arms limitation. In actual fact, there was no mention of the Soviet RS-12M missile when the United States was deciding about the Midgetman missile. The story about the "violation" in this part of the treaty appeared later, and one can understand why.

Question: What can you say about the encryption by the Soviet Union of telemetry information during ballistic missile tests:

Answer: The encryption of telemetry information transmitted from the missile is not banned by the SALT II agreement. The Second Common Understanding to Point 3 of Article XV of the treaty says that "each party is free to use various methods of transmitting telemetric information during testing, including its encryption," except in cases when such encryption "impedes verification [kontrol] of compliance with the provisions of the treaty."

What are the treaty provisions in question? First and foremost, those relating to the definition of new types of ICBM's: type of propellant, number of stages, length, largest diameter, launch-weight and throw-weight of missiles, and the number of weight of warheads. They are defined in agreed statements to Article IV of the treaty.

We are strictly complying with all this. However, since the U.S. side raised the question of encryption, the Soviet side, in a gesture of constructive approach, expressed readiness to resolve it on a reciprocal basis. We proposed to identify and agree upon the parameters of telemetric information which, in the U.S. side's opinion, must not be encrypted.

But the U.S. side has stubbornly evaded solving its own question. It has become evident that the United States is not at all interested in solving this question but needs to retain it as part of its ammunition of groundless accusations against the USSR.



Question: A radar station is being built in the USSR, in the Krasnoyarsk region, which is perceived by the U.S. Administration as a violation of the ABM Treaty. On the other hand, the United States is deploying a major radar station in Greenland and intends to deploy a similar station in Britain, which is causing anxiety on the Soviet side.

Answer: We have repeatedly produced facts to prove the United States that the Krasnoyarsk radar station, currently at the construction stage, is not meant to perform any ABM functions. It is a tracking station for objects in space, both Soviet and American. This will become finally evident when the station begins transmitting [nachnet rabotot na izlucheniye].

Regarding the new and powerful U.S. phased array radar stations, one of which is being deployed in Thule (Greenland) with the second planned for construction at Fylingdales (Britain), they really are violations of the ABM Treaty. The U.S. side itself admits it is talking about early-warning stations against ballistic missile attacks. It is well known, however, that under the treaty such stations must be sited only along the periphery of each side's national territory. Of course, neither Greenland nor Britain are either peripheral to or on the territory of the United States. Despite the fact that here the United States is clearly acting contrary to the ABM Treaty and we could have insisted that the situation be corrected without any steps in response by our side, the Soviet side, in a good-will gesture, expresses readiness to seek a solution to the problem concerning the stations. For example, with a view to easing mutual anxiety, we transmitted such a proposal to the Americans at different levels. We would halt the completion of construction at the Krasnoyarsk radar station, while the Americans would dismantle their station in Greenland and would not build a similar station in Britain.

This proposal is staring at the Americans from the table. But the United States is clearly interested not so much in eliminating the problem as in retaining it. The reason is to exploit the Krasnoyarsk radar station issue for provocative political purposes.

Question: In your opinion, what effect could U.S. President Reagan's decision have on the planned Soviet-U.S. summit meeting?

Answer: The Soviet side has repeatedly outlined its concept of USSR-U.S. summit meetings.

The holding of such a meeting requires creation of the appropriate political atmosphere and reciprocal readiness to move toward and aim for specific practical accords, primarily on arms limitation and reduction questions.

The provocative actions taken by the United States regarding nonobservance of the 1972 SALT I and the SALT II agreements offer no proof at all of its willingness to participate in the creation of the proper atmosphere, let alone to move toward specific accords. Moreover, the present U.S. Administration has shown by these actions, coupled with others of which we have repeatedly and bluntly spoken to the U.S. side, that it favors a summit meeting in words, while in practice it is doing everything to thwart the possibility of such a meeting.

Question upon question... So many questions. Listening to them you have the clear feeling that Washington's provocative actions are causing concern to the world: a legitimate concern caused by international lawlessness and the further fueling of the nuclear missile arms race.

## KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Report

PM051340 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 5 Jun 86 Second Edition p 3

[Captain 2d Rank V. Kuzar and Captain 2d Rank Ye. Nikitin report: "Washington Is Undermining Strategic Stability. At the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center"]

[Text] "How do you assess the Washington administration's refusal to implement the SALT I AND SALT II accords from the viewpoint of U.S. military interests and the policy currently followed by the White House?"

Answering this question from KRASNAYA ZVEZDA's correspondent, Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev, USSR first deputy defense minister and chief of General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, declared at a press conference for Soviet and foreign journalists held in Moscow on 4 June that neither SALT I nor SALT II have had any practical effect on U.S. military interests. They have held Soviet military programs back more. In the time that has elapsed since, the United States has dismantled for replacement only 168 strategic delivery vehicles against the USSR's 540. Here it must be said that this refusal is of a political rather than a military nature.

It often happens in politics, press conference participant A.A. Bessmertnykh, USSR deputy foreign minister, said in amplification of the answer by Marshal of the Soviet Union S.F. Akhromeyev, that a single specific episode reveals the entire essence of a political course. This is exactly what has happened now. Washington's repudiation of the SALT I and SALT II accords, despite numerous statements that the United States wishes to rid itself of the burden of nuclear weapons, displays the U.S. Administration's political unwillingness to take specific steps to ease international tension and eliminate nuclear weapons. This action revealed the U.S. course toward building up the arms race and undermining strategic stability.

A.A. Bessmertnykh specifically devoted his press conference statement to questions of strategic arms limitation: [at this point the First Edition contains the additional sentence "A few days ago the U.S. Administration undertook an action aimed at whipping up the arms race."]

President Reagan announced the United States will in the future refuse to observe in the future the 1972 Interim Agreement Limiting Offensive Strategic Arms (SALT I) [First Edition omits "SALT I"] and the 1979 Treaty on the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms (SALT II) [First Edition omits "SALT II"]. This means that the incumbent U.S. leadership has embarked on a unilateral renunciation of a commitment under a most important document in international law, which the USSR and the United States have observed on the basis of reciprocity. [At this point the First Edition contains the additional sentence "The step in question is a logical culmination of Washington's policy regarding SALT II, which began with the refusal to ratify it."]

An attempt has essentially been made to wreck the military-strategic [First Edition has "military"] parity between the USSR and the United States that is the basis for strategic stability in the world [At this point the First Edition contains the additional phrase "and to remove the existing material restrictions on the arms race."]. These actions are fraught with serious consequences for international security and have been condemned worldwide. [The last sentence reads as follows in the First Edition: "for international security. (new paragraph) They have been"]

Realizing [First Edition has "Clearly realizing"] that the announced course runs counter to the fundamental interests of the people, including the American people, leading figures in the U.S. Administration would like to obscure as far as possible the essence and purport of what they have done. To that end they are resorting to distortion of the true state of affairs, [at this point the First Edition contains the additional phrase "juggling with figures, and substituting concepts. The"] and the full force of the political disinformation machine has been brought into play.

However, the White House scenario, concocted to justify the motives behind the measures being taken to destroy the foundation of the arms limitation and reduction process, does not stand up to comparison with the real facts.

Fact one. The United States, contrary to Washington's assertions, has in recent years done nothing aimed at promoting an "atmosphere of mutual restraint" in the strategic offensive arms limitation sphere. The present administration has not reduced or even downgraded [skorrektyrovana v storonu ogranicheniya] a single military [First Edition has "arms" instead of "military"] program. On the contrary, in peacetime a comprehensive program has been worked out and is being implemented [First Edition has "set in motion" instead of "is being implemented:"] for building powerful arms in all components of the U.S. strategic triad -- new ICBM's, [At this point the First Edition contains the additional word "new"] missile submarines, heavy [At this point the First Edition contains the additional word "new" and omits "heavy"] bombers, and cruise missiles in all launch modalities. [At this point the First Edition contains the additional sentence "Essentially all the programs shelved by previous administrations for one reason or another have been reanimated."] What kind of restraint can we be talking about when even World War II battleships are "demothballed" and reequipped as nuclear weapon platforms"

The United States has embarked on the implementation of the "star wars" program and the creation of space-strike arms. Now it wants to give a space dimension to the arms race. The United States has prepared for the production of new mass destruction weapons -- chemical binary weapons. Nor does the administration's stubborn reluctance to join in the existing Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions attest to restraint. In no way does Washington want to eschew nuclear explosions, which are carried out in order to create the latest types of weapons, including space weapons.

Fact two. It is not the Soviet Union, as the White House claims, but the United States that refuses to conduct serious talks in the arms limitation and reduction sphere.

The Soviet Union has put forward an integrated program for eliminating nuclear, chemical, and other types of mass destruction weapons in the world [the First Edition omits "in the world"]. It has submitted proposals for significant reductions in conventional arms and armed forces in Europe [First Edition has "for conventional arms and armed forces reductions"]. At the talks on nuclear and space arms the USSR has proposed specific measures for implementing the first phase of a nuclear disarmament program -- agreeing to radical, 50-percent reductions in the relevant nuclear arms of the USSR and the United States and eliminating all Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in the European zone.

Has the United States made any new proposals at the talks recently? No, not a single new proposal has emerged from the U.S. side.

Fact three. U.S. representatives, including the President, try to justify the decision to drop SALT I and SALT II by citing "Soviet violations" of these documents. [At this point the First Edition contains the additional passage "They cite the appearance in the USSR of an alleged second new type of ICBM -- the SS-25 -- and the 'excessive encryption' of telemetry information during missile launches. In this context the construction of a radar station in Krasnoyarsk is also mentioned, although, let us note in passing, this radar station has nothing to do with SALT II."] There is no substantial foundation for any of the U.S. [First Edition has "these" instead of "U.S."] claims. [At this point the First Edition contains the additional phrase "The Soviet side has demonstrated more than once, on the basis of concrete data, that"] The United States is deliberately distorting the picture and is diverting attention from its own violations of treaties and agreements. [At this point the First Edition contains the additional sentence "And the more it talks about Soviet "violations" the more obvious this truth becomes."]

Fact four. By renouncing observance of SALT I and SALT II, the U.S. Administration would simultaneously like to give the impression that it will "technically" observe [the preceding clause appear in the First Edition as follows: U.S. Administration would also like to gain some political capital. While giving the impression that they will 'technically' observe' SALT II for another few months (until MIRVed strategic delivery vehicles exceed the limit of 1,320 units [at this point the First Edition contains the additional phrase "as a result of the deployment of bombers with cruise missiles"], the Americans are declaring that they will, you see, observe the Soviet side's behavior throughout this period and "take it into account."

It is absurd to adopt this approach [at this point the First Edition contains the additional clause "in any event, and especially now" and omits the next two sentences]. Violators of treaties are not entitled to assume the role of their guardians. Moreover, it is impossible to proclaim the treaty and the accord to be "dead" and simultaneously to observe them, even "technically."

Washington's current course can be summed up as follows: If some U.S. military program conflicts with the existing treaty restrictions the agreements will be discarded. [At this point the First Edition contains the additional sentence "Arms get priority."]. While basically doing nothing to achieve new accords [at this point the First Edition contains the additional phrase "in the arms limitation sphere"], the United States is breaking the treaties and agreements that were already achieved in the seventies in the arms limitation sphere [the final part of this sentence reads as follows in the First Edition: "and agreements that have already been achieved"].

[At this point the First Edition contains the following additional paragraph: "This approach will do Washington no good either from the viewpoint of strengthening U.S. security or from the view point of Soviet-American relations or the development of the world situation as a whole."]

As the Soviet Government statement says, the United States will not manage to acquire military advantages for itself at the expense of others' security. The Soviet Union will take the necessary practical steps to prevent strategic military parity from being undermined. And The U.S. side should have no illusions about this.

The press conference participants answered numerous questions posed by journalists.

In particular, the reply to the question what the consequences would be -- from the viewpoint of the effect on international security -- of a decision by Reagan on nonobservance of the SALT agreements was as follows:

The consequences would be most negative and dangerous. Reagan's decision would effectively mean the destruction of a treaty system that curbs the nuclear arms race. This provocative step would cause an unbridled nuclear arms race and it would jeopardize the possibility of concluding new agreements. All this is taking place in conditions of the implementations of "star wars." It is clear that in this situation world tension would greatly increase and events in the sphere of arms creation [sozdaniye] would develop in an unpredictable way and could get out of human control.

The following question was asked. It was again pointed out in the Reagan statement that the SS-25 missile is a second new type of ICBM, banned under SALT II. Is this the case? And if not, why is it being so persistently repeated?

Here is the reply to this question: The Soviet Union has tested only one new type of ICBM -- the RS-22. This is permitted under SALT II.

When they refer to the testing of a second new type of ICBM in the Soviet Union, the Americans have in mind the RS-12M missile which is a modernization of our old ICBM, the RS-12. This kind of modernization is not prohibited and was carried out in strict compliance with the provisions of the treaty.

In the United States the clear provision of SALT II on the list of the elements which make up the so-called "throw-weight" of a missile was deliberately distorted. At variance with this provision the weight of certain elements which make up the throw weight of the old missile (RS-12) (means to overcome ABM defense and the warhead guidance device) is not included, while on the other hand, the weight of equipment used only during testing is illegitimately included in the throw weight of the modernized ICBM (the RS-12M). This is how they managed to create a "problem."

The aim is obvious. The United States already has one new type of ICBM (the MX missile). Now it is creating [sozdayut] another new type of ICBM (the Midgetman), which is at variance with the treaty. Hence stem the attempts to gain some kind of "right" to a second new type of ICBM and at the same time to slander the USSR as a partner in talks and to prepare the ground for the renunciation of the obligation to observe treaty provisions in the sphere of strategic arms limitation. [At this point the first edition contains the additional sentence: "On 27 May, the U.S. President translated this scheme into reality." This concluded the report published in the first edition.] In actual fact, there was no mention of the Soviet RS-12M missile at the time when the United States was making the decision about the Midgetman missile in addition to the MS. The story about the "Soviet violation" in this part of the treaty appeared later, and one can understand why.

The question about the encryption of telemetric information during ballistic missile tests by the Soviet Union was also raised at the press conference. Is this not a violation of SALT II?

It was emphasized in reply that the encryption of telemetric information transmitted from the missile is not banned by SALT II. The Second Common Understanding to Point 3 of Article XV of the treaty says that "each party" is free to use various methods of transmitting telemetric information during testing, including its encryption," except in cases when such encryption "impedes verification [kontrol] of compliance with the provisions of the treaty."

What are the treaty provisions in question? First and foremost, those relating to the definition of new types of ICBM's: type of propellant, number of stages, length, largest diameter, launch-weight and throw-weight of missiles, and the number and weight of warheads. They are defined in agreed statements to Article IV of the treaty.

We are strictly complying with all this. However, since the U.S. side raised the question of encryption, the Soviet side, in a gesture of a constructive approach, expressed readiness to resolve it on a reciprocal basis. We proposed to identify and agree upon the parameters of telemetric information which, in the U.S. side's opinion, must not be encrypted.

But the U.S. side has stubbornly evaded solving its own question. It has become evident, in light of the decision made by the United States regarding SALT II, that the United States is not at all interested in solving this question but needs to retain it as part of its ammunition of groundless accusations against the USSR.

A question was also asked about the fact that a radar station is being built in the USSR, in the Krasnoyarsk region, which is perceived by the U.S. Administration as a violation of the ABM Treaty. It is also known, on the other hand, that the United States is deploying a major radar station in Greenland and intends to deploy a similar station in Britain, with all this causing anxiety on the Soviet side. Is it not necessary to clarify the situation concerning this matter?

We have repeatedly produced facts, it was said in reply to this question, to prove to the United States that the Krasnoyarsk radar station, which is currently at the construction stage, is not meant to perform any ABM functions. It is a tracking station for objects in space, both Soviet and American, and in no way falls within the ABM Treaty. This will finally become evident when the station begins transmitting [nachnet rabotat na izlucheniye].

Regarding the new and powerful U.S. phased array radar stations, one of which is being deployed in Thule (Greenland) with the second planned for construction at Fylingdales (Britain), they are violations of the ABM Treaty. The U.S. side itself admits that it is talking about early-warning stations against ballistic missile attacks. It is well known, however, that under the treaty such stations must be sited only along the periphery of each side's national territory. Of course, neither Greenland nor Britain are either periphery or territory of the United States. Despite the fact that here the United States is clearly acting contrary to the ABM Treaty and we could have insisted that the situation be corrected without any steps in response by our side, the Soviet side, in a gesture of goodwill, expresses readiness to seek a solution to the problem concerning the stations. For example, with a view to ease mutual anxiety, we transmitted such a proposal to the Americans at different levels. We would halt the completion of construction at the Krasnoyarsk radar station, while the Americans would dismantle their station in Greenland and would not build a similar station in Britain.

This proposal is staring at the Americans from the table. But the United States is clearly interested not so much in eliminating the problem as in retaining it. The reason is obvious -- to exploit the Krasnoyarsk radar station issue for provocative political purposes and complicate the arms limitation and reduction process.

The following question was asked at the press conference. In your opinion, what effect could U.S. President Reagan's decision have on the planned Soviet-U.S. summit meeting?

It was emphasized in reply to this question that the Soviet side has repeatedly outlined its concept of USSR-U.S. summit meetings. Its essence is that meetings between the top leaders of the two countries must not be isolated from events occurring in the world and in Soviet-U.S. relations, particularly in the security sphere.

In other words, the holding of such a meeting requires the creation of the appropriate political atmosphere and also reciprocal readiness to move toward and aim for specific practical accords, primarily on arms limitation and reduction questions.

The provocative actions taken by the United States regarding the nonobservance of the SALT I and SALT II agreements offer no proof at all of its willingness to participate in the creation of the proper atmosphere, let alone to move toward specific accords. Moreover, the U.S. Administration has shown by these actions, coupled with others of which we have repeatedly and bluntly spoken to the U.S. side, that it favors a summit meeting in words, while in practice it is doing everything to thwart the possibility of such a meeting.

This is how we perceive now the question of a summit meeting in light of the U.S. Administration's practical actions.

Other questions by journalists were also answered.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1408

## SALT/START ISSUES

### MOSCOW TALK SHOW ON U.S.-EUROPEAN STRAINS

LD081955 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 8 Jun 86

["International Observers Round Table" program, with Gennadiy Shishkin, first deputy general director of TASS; Viktor Levin, All-Union Radio foreign policy commentator, and moderated by Nikolay Agayants]

[Excerpt] [Agayants] Hello Comrades! Among the events and phenomena in which this week has been so rich, I would like to single out immediately one thing that in my view has yet again highlighted clearly and very fully the chief trend of increasing confrontation between two courses, the two policies on the world scene today, which are pursued on the one hand by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, and on the other by the United States and its allies in various aggressive blocs. The thing that I have in mind is first and foremost the clearly expressed attempt by the Washington administration to upset the military parity between the USSR and the United States which, as we all know, is the basis of strategic stability in the world. This time the attack is being made on the SALT II treaty -- an attack that is being actively joined not only by the President, but also by other high-ranking White House officials such as Pentagon chief Caspar Weinberger, State Department head George Sultz, and others of their ilk. Washington's dangerous course could be summed up as follows: When any U.S. military program starts to be in glaring contradiction to existing treaty limitations, these limitations are simply discarded by the administration. Why is this? What do you think lies at the base of it all, Gennadiy Arkadyevich?

[Shishkin] What I would say is that this week has in general been characterized by the fact that all the events that occurred were pushed into the background, as it were, by the explosion of indignation that has now seized the whole world over the decision by the Reagan administration to unilaterally denounce the extremely important documents of international law that have up to now kept the strategic arms race in check. Even the faithful U.S. NATO allies are now gripped by confusion, having seen for themselves where the ruinous consequences their constant connivance with the Washington hawks has led. Reflecting this mood, the British bourgeois newspaper THE GUARDIAN, for example, writes: If Europe has any influence left at all, it will fight desperately for the preservation of SALT II and the continuation of efforts in the sphere of arms reduction. It is a fight that must not be evaded or waged half-heartedly.

[Levin] One could add to the statement by that newspaper numerous statements by the press press in other West European countries.



The French L'ECHO writes that the Western alliance -- meaning NATO as a whole -- is undergoing a most acute crisis. The crisis in NATO is also described by the West German WESTDEUTSCHE ALLGEMEINE, which notes that, while there have previously been periods of uncertainty in the North Atlantic alliance, it is only rarely that the signs of a split have manifested themselves so strongly. Now a large number of press organs in Western Europe are following up the statement of this fact with an analysis of what exactly has happened and why. Very typical of this, in my view, is something that was published by the British newspaper TODAY. It writes that the decisions by the U.S. presidents to ignore the provisions of the SALT II treaty have given rise to such a negative reaction additionally because quite recently, in early May at the meeting of the "Big Seven," Reagan twisted the arms of his West European partners to get their support for the theory of so-called international terrorism as interpreted by the United States, having stated before that he favors preserving the SALT II treaty. Then the West European countries, having as it were gained support for their stance regarding the need to preserve SALT II, took a step in their turn to meet the Washington administration halfway. Now Washington is trying cynically and brazenly -- TODAY does not draw this conclusion although there is every reason to draw it -- to twist the West Europeans around its little finger. It has forced them to join its policy of fighting against so-called international terrorism, which is in fact a policy of fighting against the national liberation movement, and it is rejecting the SALT II treaty.

I think that this very stormy reaction in Western Europe against the U.S. stance on SALT II is not due to this fact alone. Concentrated here, gathered here, are all the things that have been making themselves felt in the recent past. Just look. When Washington drew up the Strategic Defense Initiative program -- the star wars program -- this also met with a negative reaction in Western Europe. The United States then put a little pressure on the West Europeans, and first Britain, then the FRG, and then Italy joined the program. They did make certain provisos, but one way or another Western Europe basically followed the United States. After that -- I will not give a chronology of the developments, but just certain events -- there was an attack on Libya, an attack, a terrorist act, an act of international banditry that evoked indignation in the full sense of the word in Western Europe. Western Europe let it be known that the problem should be solved by political means, and in no way by resorting to the terrorist methods that Washington was insisting on. Washington scored that opinion.

In Bern quite recently, as we all remember, there was a meeting of experts within the framework of the Helsinki process on the development of contacts between people, institutions, and organizations. It was a complex meeting. There were many discussions, and they were acute ones. Common sense ultimately made it possible, however, to draw up a document that 34 countries represented at the meeting were ready to sign -- virtually all the countries that there were except the United States, which at the last moment refused to sign. They say that FRG Foreign Minister Genscher made a special telephone call to U.S. Secretary of State Shultz to persuade him to instruct the U.S. delegation to support the document, too, because it was a slap in the face to Western Europe. Shultz ignored it.

The last of these events was the U.S. foisting on Western Europe of a program of chemical rearmament -- U.S. chemical rearmament -- which means the creation of stocks of binary chemical shells that can be sited in Western Europe. So first one concession, then another concession, and then a third concession led to the United States no longer taking Western Europe into account at all, and the West Europeans realized that if they were to continue on the same path, their interests would be absolutely wiped out, suppressed by the United States. At the same time, I should say that this is not so much a matter of emotional attitudes -- and no one likes being ordered about -- but of fundamental issues.

The United States is sacrificing the security interests of Western Europe and, one could also mention, its economic interests, by attempts to cut back trade between Western Europe and the Soviet Union, which the United States insists on very strongly. This goes fundamentally against the vital interests of the West European countries. I think that in the reaction to SALT II all this has manifested itself quite acutely, and it indicates that Western Europe has no wish to play the role in its alliance with Washington of the horse on which the Washington rider prances.

[Agayants] All that is certainly right, Viktor Nikolayevich, but once again I would like to draw attention to the following. The United States, while undertaking no practical action to achieve new agreements and accords on disarmament, is essentially rejecting the ones that have been adopted in the sphere of arms reduction. By its attitude to SALT II, the United States is revealing, in all its clarity, the essence of the current U.S. foreign policy course as one aimed at an all-out arms race, the militarization of space, and the further whipping up of international tension. In their statements on television, Shultz and Weinberger go on and on like machines speaking about the U.S. desire to show restraint and about the President's calls on the Soviet Union to join that course. But behind the loud words and confused oratory there is nothing concrete. Indicative in this respect was the press briefing in the White House on 3 June during which an administration spokesman answered a hail of direct questions by twisting and turning, but was in fact unable to explain anything to the journalists. Replying in particular to a question as to why it was that the SALT II treaty was not to the liking of the U.S., the official replied: Because, as the secretary of state has said, the treaty is becoming more and more obsolete. It does not even have a legal basis. We are entering into a structure, if you like, of new restraint, and we call upon the Russians to do the same. This is the way that Washington, doing a tightrope act with words, tries to confuse the issue.

[Shishkin] I think that all this shows quite obviously that Washington is now in fact coming up against quite strong opposition, not only in Western Europe, but at home, too. And hence, it seems to me, the Reagan administration is now in fact forced to go on to the defense, using the most unseemly methods that it has in its arsenal. By abusing its position, using all types of sophistry to disorient public opinion, resorting to outright falsification, manipulating the mass media, and whipping up a chauvinistic fervor in the country, the U.S. leadership, in order to please the extreme reactionary circles, is trying to conceal its attempt to upset the military parity between the Soviet Union and the United States which is the basis of strategic stability in the world, and is trying to justify all this by alleging that the Soviet Union has been violating the SALT II treaty.

[Agayants] Gennadiy Arkadiyevich, in the Soviet Government statement and at the news conference for Soviet and foreign journalists which took place this week in Moscow, it was clearly shown that such claims are unsubstantiated from beginning to end. The Soviet Union has not committed and is not committing any violations of the SALT II treaty, and the U.S. Government knows this well. The Soviet side has with facts at hand frequently exposed Washington's attempts, whenever any new U.S. military program is introduced that goes beyond the bounds of the existing treaty restrictions, to put forward far-fetched accusations against the Soviet Union.

[Shishkin] One should note, however, that despite all the efforts of the White House, very many critical and skeptical statements are creeping into commentaries, even in the bourgeois U.S. press. For example, the well-known magazine TIME writes that Reagan's statement last week signifies an important change in U.S. policy.

It is precisely this that has aroused the indignation of many U.S. allies in NATO, and also of the Soviet Union. This probably will have a negative effect on the chances for the holding of a second Soviet-U.S. summit meeting this year. U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT, an openly right-wing U.S. magazine that is known for its close links with the Pentagon and that usually supports the administration, stresses that in making his decisions regarding the SALT II treaty Reagan has given preference to an exceptionally dangerous strategy which has far-reaching consequences for arms control, the Western alliance, and the balance of power between the superpowers. This magazine notes that in the United States itself Reagan's decision is evoking anxiety even in the Joint Chiefs of Staff. They, the magazine writes, are worried by the fact that an open refusal to observe the SALT II treaty will worsen the U.S. position.

[Agayants] It is clear that these fears by competent U.S. military experts are not without some basis. For example, Academician Velikhov, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, writes the following in an article just published in the magazine KOMMUNIST: As a scientist, I can state with full authority that our country possesses such a scientific, technical and production potential that in reply to any challenge we can create the most sophisticated weapons systems. By the way, this sort of thing has been frequently confirmed in recent decades. But this is not our choice, this is a course of action that has been foisted upon us, and that is diverting us from peaceful constructive work.

[Levin] Yes, it is worth dwelling on this. The Soviet Union rejects the primitive idea that the more weapons a state has, the more security it acquires. In the nuclear age this is no longer the case. In actual fact, in conditions of rivalry, stimulated by the U.S. military and industrial complex to increase the number of nuclear warheads and make military equipment more sophisticated, the exact opposite situation results. A qualitatively new level of military threat also makes new demands on defense means and on measures for ensuring the safety of the civilian population. Actions give rise to the appropriate counteractions. Thus, this is a vicious circle, and it can only be broken through agreements reached on a principled basis, whose final goal can only be that of scrapping nuclear weapons completely. This path is clearly and convincingly presented in the 15 January statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev on the phased elimination of nuclear weapons and other mass-destruction weapons by the year 2000.

[Shishkin] Viktor Nikolayevich, in connection with this I would like to note that of course it is no accident that the Soviet program for nuclear disarmament that you have just been talking about has been winning increasing numbers of new supporters throughout the world. Let us take, for example, a U.S. figure who is far from being someone who sympathizes with the Soviet Union -- (Hooks), former deputy secretary for the U.S. Air Force. In an article published in the United States this week he writes, and I quote: An intelligent assessment of the proposals set forth by General Secretary Gorbachev on 15 January amounts to the following: They promise a good opportunity for halting the siting of new kinds of weapons and reducing and stabilizing the colossal destructive might of both sides, which is sufficient for the destruction of each other many times over; and they create a favorable atmosphere for an improvement in the political relations between the two powers. In calling on the U.S. Administration to go from words to deeds in the matter of reducing armaments, the Russians have gone more than halfway. There is other evidence of the seriousness of the intentions of the Soviet Union on the matter of arms control. The main goal set by the 27th CPSU Congress, this former secretary notes, is to bring the economy into a healthy state, but in order to achieve this goal a stable international situation, and particularly stable relations with the United States, are needed. In the first place, Moscow has to avoid a new wide-scale arms race.

[Agayants] As you know, World Environment Day was marked on 5 June. It was commemorated, as has already been reported in the press, by the ceremony of the symbolic planting of a peace tree. As a statement by the Soviet Government stresses, this embodies the profound meaning of jointly defending our earth and affirming the choice worthy of people who favor peace and security and oppose war. We are deeply convinced that in the nuclear and space age, the security and survival of every state and international security as a whole can only be ensured not through military-technical solutions, not by multiplying arsenals and making weapons more sophisticated, but by consistently reducing and then completely scrapping mass-destruction weapons. It was precisely on World Environment Day that the United States, contrary to reason and in defiance of the will of peace-loving peoples, exploded yet another nuclear device at its test site in Nevada. This explosion, codenamed "Tajo," brought the number of tests carried out by the United States over the period since 1951 up to 651.

[Levin] By the way, Nikolay Ivanovich, do you recall how many explosions this makes since we introduced the moratorium on nuclear tests?

[Agayants] In all the Americans have carried out 12 such blasts. One should stress again that, indeed, the problem of protecting and improving the environment has long since ceased to be the affair of individual countries. It is of a pronounced global nature and for it to be solved the joining of efforts of peoples in all states is required. Our country has drawn the necessary and serious conclusions for itself from the Chernobyl accident and consistently comes out in favor of the broadest possible cooperation with all states in the solution of this problem as well. It is clear that such cooperation can only be implemented in conditions of stable peace on earth, and it is inseparable from the struggle of all people of good-will -- wherever they may live and whatever views they may hold -- from the resolute and consistent struggle to avert the most awful thing that might befall the planet earth, a nuclear holocaust. But the Americans are intensifying the arms race not only on earth but in space as well.

[Shishkin] Many people are of course beginning to question why President Reagan -- as we have already said here -- is continuing, against all reason and contrary to elementary logic, to advertise his program of star wars preparations as being purely defensive and to make assurances that it really is so. This question was answered this week by a U.S. political figure, with what I would describe as cynical frankness. He is well known in the United States and quite well known in our country too, namely Albert Gore, who wrote the following in THE NEW YORK TIMES: The President is still talking about the Strategic Defense Initiative as an all-encompassing defense system destined to replace our dependence upon the classical restraint, which is the threat of retaliation to a Soviet attack. Many administration representatives define the Strategic Defense Initiative, however, as a limited system for defending our retaliatory missile forces that will back them up rather than replace them. While the President is still dreaming of an economical and invulnerable system of antimissile defense that would be deployed [razvernuto] jointly both by us and the Soviet Union, his secretary of defense is working out a rapid system to be deployed [razmeshchen] as soon as possible, regardless of how economical it is and regardless of cooperation with the Soviet Union.

[Agayants] As we can see, comrades, the Soviet Union was a thousand times right when it warned the world that Reagan's star wars program is aimed at whipping up the arms race, its goal being to attain military superiority over the Soviet Union and that it is fraught with the danger of unleashing a nuclear war. How can it be otherwise?

Let us recall, for instance, the results of the so-called purely scientific Manhattan Project, which was also made out to be an exclusively research program. It is common knowledge how it turned out for the population of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Fifteen billion dollars was spent on that program. In the 30 years between 1954 and 1983, \$40 billion was spent on all scientific research work in the sphere of missile technology. Twenty-six billion dollars, however, is to be spent on the star wars research program in the near future, and in the decade from 1984 to 1993, \$60 billion. If such research work -- if one can call it that -- continues for another 10 years, experts suggest this it will cost a total of \$225 billion.

Considering such gigantic sums, it is naive to suppose that they would be spent solely on elucidating some theoretical questions relating to the possibility or impossibility of creating [sozdanye] space-strike weapons.

[Shishkin] The statement by Keyworth, the U.S. President's science adviser, is unambiguous, and I quote: We are engaged in research not to expand our knowledge of physics, but to learn how to create [sozdavat] large systems. What is thus involved is by no means pure research, but a serious stage in increasing military potential on a global scale. Using as a cover a verbal screen about the defensive nature of the Strategic Defense Initiative, it is not difficult to launch the development and creation [sozdaniye] of new means of attack as highly refined as you like.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1409

## EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

TASS: CSSR DELEGATE ADDRESSES MBFR SESSION

LD301345 Moscow TASS in English 1157 GMT 30 May 86

[Text] Vienna May 30 TASS --Head of the delegation of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic L. Handl addressed the plenary meeting today at the Vienna talks on Mutual Reduction of Armed Forces and Armaments in Central Europe. In his speech the Czechoslovak delegate devoted much attention to the Soviet peace initiatives aimed at the establishment of a comprehensive system of international security.

Czechoslovakia, L. Handl said, whole-heartedly supports the Soviet Union's peace proposals -- the fact reflected in the decisions of the 17th Congress of the Communist party of Czechoslovakia.

Having reiterated the interest of the socialist countries in attaining a mutually acceptable agreement at the Vienna talks, the head of the Czechoslovak delegation stated that arms reduction and a freeze on their level should be an inseparable element of the process of reaching such an agreement. L. Handl criticized the policy of the NATO countries that were stubbornly evading the solution of that question.

/9716

CSO: 5200/1405

## EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

### IZVESTIYA SEES POTENTIAL FOR 'SUCCESSFUL' CDE CONCLUSION

#### Correspondent's Dispatch

PM060826 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 May 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent A. Sychev dispatch: "Vigorous Action"]

[Text] Stockholm -- A buzzer sounded in the Kulturhuset foyer, indicating the end of the latest session of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe [CDE]. Hardly had they left the plenary session hall than the delegation heads encountered a tight circle of correspondents. The main question was "what were the results of the session?"

Special envoy O.A. Grinevskiy, the Soviet delegation leader, answered: "The main work has been done in editorial groups. Interesting and, in our view, quite productive work is being done in the group dealing with questions of notification. Useful work has been done in the group dealing with observance; there has also been movement, albeit tentative, in the group dealing with the nonuse of force. Yet it must be said that the editing process is proceeding extremely slowly and mainly on secondary questions."

As is well known, the Stockholm conference is called upon to solve the acute and sensitive questions of security and confidence in Europe, questions closely linked with the overall state of affairs in the world. That is why the existence of two opposing courses in international policy, the socialist countries' constructive steps, and the active opposition to them on the part of the West are naturally leaving their mark on the progress of the conference.

The peace initiatives put forward recently by the Soviet Union have undoubtedly promoted the creation of a more favorable atmosphere at Stockholm. Following the fundamental line of their foreign policy -- to use all means to promote the quickest building of a reliable universal security system -- the USSR and the socialist states have taken an active stance at the conference. The socialist countries have made constructive proposals allowing the forum to gain impetus on all points of the final document.

It would be no exaggeration to say that most delegations are expressing sincere interest in the success of the conference. This is particularly shown in the position of the group of neutral and nonaligned states, and even among the NATO countries a growing interest in the search for accords can be noted.

But the conference continues to encounter other trends in its work. The overall hardening of Washington's foreign policy has been clearly seen in the position of the delegations from the United States and its closest NATO allies, which have substantially held up the conference's work.

Nobody, of course, expects the work of a forum such as the Stockholm conference to be easy. However, the problems that have arisen are often of an artificial nature.

The group dealing with the question of the nonuse of force continues to encounter serious difficulties. The attempts by its coordinator to activate the editorial work on aspects where viewpoints coincide have still not been met with the proper understanding by a number of Western states.

Notification or, rather, definition of the types of notification of military activity is another area of still unresolved problems. This question lies at the basis of several avenues: working out notification parameters for each type of activity, exchanging annual plans, and inviting observers.

In order to untie this knot and accelerate the elaboration of militarily substantive accords, the Soviet Union has proposed examining the notification problem in its different aspects. However, the United States and a number of other states are categorically refusing to provide notification about independent aircraft and naval activity.

Not extending confidence-building measures to aircraft means retaining the possibility of using them for blackmail and scare purposes and for carrying out a direct threat. Persistent attempts are made to exclude troop transfers to the European zone from notification too. The thrust of this approach is quite obvious -- to prevent the elaboration of substantive measures that would reduce the threat of military confrontation in Europe.

In order to give positive impetus at the conference to a businesslike discussion of this aspect the Soviet delegation put forward at the recent session specific parameters for ensuring notification of major ground forces exercises carried out independently or jointly with any possible air or naval force components or amphibious and airborne assault troops, indicating the numbers of divisions and any independent air exercises.

The position of the United States and its closest allies looks no better on the question of restrictions on military activity either. The level, scale, and intensity of exercises on the European continent these days are steadily increasing. Thousands of exercises each year on different scales are held in Europe. As a consequence the scale of activity is growing repeatedly and tension is intensifying.

Taking all these factors into account, the socialist states and the neutral and non-aligned countries have submitted a number of proposals to limit both the scale of exercises and their number. However, the British delegation stated that for it the general concept of a limitation threshold was unacceptable.

The Stockholm conference is a sensitive indicator of the desire and readiness of states to really strengthen confidence and security and strive to reduce the danger of war in Europe. There is only just enough time left. Yet the conference retains the potential for a successful conclusion. This would make it possible to decide to move to the conference's second phase devoted to disarmament in Europe and to give new impetus to the development of the Helsinki process in all its aspects.



Foreign Ministry Spokesman

PM031149 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 May 86 Morning Edition p 6

[TASS report: "At the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center"]

[Text] There was a briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center on 27 May on current problems of international relations. It was addressed by V.B. Lomeyko, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Section, who drew attention to the new Soviet initiative expounded by M.S. Gorbachev at his meeting with British parliamentarians. In connection with the conference of experts from the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe countries that has ended in Bern, it was noted that at the last moment the U.S. delegation blocked the adoption of a final document elaborated on the basis of protracted consultation and compromises among all the participants.

This act can only be seen as a further illustration of the U.S. uncereemonious and crude attitude toward the Europeans' needs and an attempt to undermine the all-European process.

In reply to questions about the work of the Stockholm conference, the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman stressed that there is every chance of a successful completion of the first stage of this most important international forum provided there is a mutual desire on the part of the sides to achieve accords. This desire exists on the socialist side. This is evidence, in particular, by the socialist countries' specific, constructive proposals in all spheres of the conference's activity and their vigorous search for solutions to unresolved problems. But the United States and some of its allies are continuing, on various farfetched pretexts, to hinder the elaboration of mutually acceptable accords.

In the present situation the success or failure of the Stockholm conference is the willingness to seek -- not in words, but in deeds -- to reduce the danger of war on our continent. This is also essential for the new all-European meeting in Vienna that could decide to switch to the second phase of the conference, devoted to disarmament in Europe, which would contribute to the development of the Helsinki process in all spheres.

/9716

CSO: 5200/1405

## EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

### FRG PAPERS VIEW GORBACHEV'S EAST BERLIN SPEECH

Proposals Said To Aim at Post-Reagan Era

Frankfurt FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU in German 22 April 86 p 3

[Editorial by Karl-Heinz Baum: "Message for the West"]

[Text] Berlin--The 11th SED Party Congress is over. General Secretary Erich Honecker was reelected; the Politburo, the actual ruling body in the GDR, was made slightly younger with four new members. Wages are to rise; the baby year is to be instituted with the first child; in the middle of next year the children's allowance will more than double for two or three children; the economy is to be further intensified and speeded up with even more electronics. These probably ought to be the basic pronouncements of this fourth party congress led by Erich Honecker.

However, the message from this SED party congress is an entirely different one. The General Secretary of the CPSU Mikhail Gorbachev put his stamp on it with his appearances before the plenum and on the site of the Potsdam Agreement concluded almost 41 years ago in the Prussian castle of Caecilienhof. The message for the West is this: In spite of SDI [Space Defense Initiative], in spite of bombs on Libya, the Soviets and with them the other countries of the Warsaw Pact are ready to talk.

Gorbachev emphasized this impressively with his proposal issued in East Berlin "to significantly reduce" conventional troops from the Atlantic to the Urals. He has thus undertaken an advance which--judging from the Western reaction--will not immediately be rejected like many previous Soviet proposals. In Bonn, Minister of Foreign Affairs Genscher and Minister of Defense Woerner jointly favor careful examination, and the response from Washington is not much different.

How serious the Soviet Union is about the reduction of conventional troops and armaments will only be determined through the negotiations of the experts. Many a great announcement has been ground down to nothing in the mills of the debates of the experts. It may be Gorbachev's goal to attempt again with this proposal to get US forces out of Western Europe or at least to reduce them considerably, an old Soviet dream in the 40 years since the anti-Hitler coalition based on the Potsdam Conference broke down.

The proposal also clearly has psychological targets: People in Western European countries will ask why we really must prolong compulsory military service--caused by the so-called "pill pinch," the decline in the birthrate--since there will soon be bilateral troop reduction in Europe anyway. Furthermore, the East Bloc is plagued by the same problem. Gorbachev can be believed when he says that the countries of the socialist camp would rather use increasingly more men who are now soldiers in the "building up of socialism." Furthermore, the reduction of Soviet forces can in fact possibly do more to reduce the "fear of the Russians" which exists in Europe than the reduction of atomic rockets, the strike force of which exceeds all powers of imagination anyway.

It was no accident that Gorbachev assured the Western Europeans at the westernmost outpost of his empire that the Soviet Union will never strike West Europe and guaranteed the single wish of reducing fear. In any case, Gorbachev's proposal is also a contribution to raising Soviet credibility in Western Europe. It comes at a time when Western Europeans, as the discussions between London and Rome indicate, are increasingly hard pressed to identify with the current government of the United States. Because the outcome of the proposals can only be measured in 3 years at the very least, and possible only in 10 years, it is also obvious that the young man--compared to US President Reagan--in the Kremlin is already looking toward the post-Reagan era and that Gorbachev is already laying the ground work for it.

For current politics there is the willingness for dialog announced by Gorbachev and repeated in harmony by SED General Secretary Erich Honecker and GDR Premier Willi Stoph that the meetings scheduled for this year between Reagan and Gorbachev as well as meetings at a lower level between Honecker and FRG Chancellor Kohl could take place--could, if no other strains intervene.

Gorbachev's demand for more economic involvement of the GDR and the other East Bloc countries in CEMA should cause much more concern for the GDR general secretary and his comrades in arms in the politburo (the political amalgamation of the EEC sends its regards). But the GDR is now an example of workaholics for the Soviet Union. What did Gorbachev say about that? The abbreviation DDR [GDR] is translated into Russian as "dawai, dawai, rabotaty"--fast, fast, work.

#### Proposals Called Primarily 'Propaganda'

Frankfurt FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE ZEITUNG in German 23 April 86 p 1

[Editorial by Fritz Ullrich Fack: "Disarmament As a Poker Game"]

[Text] A couple of years have passed now since the Soviets promised at the height of their anti-armament campaign to "scrap" all of their SS-20 rockets aimed at Europe down to a minimum if the West would renounce further armament. This truly amazing offer and its pathetic history in Geneva come to mind this week as one studies the cascadelike disarmament offers of General Secretary Gorbachev which range from the three-stage plan for abolishing all nuclear weapons to the reduction of conventional forces and weapons systems in Europe--"from the Atlantic to the Urals."

The former offer of "liquidation" of most Soviet mid-range rockets came from a famous mouth, i.e., from General Secretary Brezhnev. The Americans demonstrated great interest at that time and sought in Geneva to find out how that could be put into practical terms. Paul Nitze led the negotiations on the American side.

Very much to Nitze's displeasure, this newspaper--unchallenged--displayed details from the poker hand which revealed the complete implausibility of the Soviet disarmament offers. The general secretary's scrapping offer, spiritedly celebrated by the German leftist press, melted away in Geneva under Nitze's penetrating questions like butter in the sun. After countless painful convolutions it turned out that Moscow was ready not actually to "scrap" the rockets themselves but only their launching devices--in plain English: the special gun carriages. Because after the general secretary had once used the ominous word something in fact had to be scrapped. The moral of the story is that what general secretaries say is primarily intended for propaganda consumption. The "military-industrial complex" of the Soviet Union does not hesitate to disavow the general secretary if need be--provided that one does not assume that a rigged game is being played here.

Under the energetic Gorbachev we hear the trusting souls in this country again say that things will naturally be totally different. They say his offers must be taken at face value, confirmation of details saved for later. Here we can only recommend that the "details" really be dealt with, and priority be given, in fact, to those which are similar to Brezhnev's words "rocket liquidation."

This means the issue of the monitoring of all of those disarmament measures which Gorbachev is so freely offering. Among these he already has said with the first proposal--the three-stage plan for elimination of all nuclear weapons by the turn of the century--that the Soviet Union is prepared to permit international "on-site inspections" in addition to "national" verification measures. The specialists in the field pricked up their ears. Does this mean that the "keyhole thesis" from PRAVDA on 24 January 1984, according to which no one would be allowed to look into the private military activity of the Soviet Union, no longer holds?

Thus Gorbachev decided now when making his latest disarmament proposals in East Berlin to express nothing further about the inspection issue. He spoke conspicuously about "national means" and weakened on-site monitoring to a means to be used "if necessary." To really be able to evaluate this veiled retreat, one must find out what opposition the military mounted following Gorbachev's first monitoring speech.

They sent in Deputy Defense Minister Schabanov, who chairs the major administrative authority for weapons and armament in the Soviet general staff, and the government newspaper IZVESTIYA opened its columns to him. There the monitoring offer shriveled down to nothing just as Brezhnev's scrapping offer had once done, for only once were "reasonable measures" of (on-site) monitoring mentioned, which only can be considered when they "really contribute to the reduction of the arms race." National monitoring means would always have priority, and on-site monitoring would always be made

dependent on the scope of the disarmament steps agreed to. But on-site inspections which would only serve "to interfere in the internal affairs of other countries" would be completely out of the question. There it is again: the keyhole thesis.

It is consistent with that--and not with Gorbachev--that the Soviet Union has come to the Vienna troop reduction negotiations with a proposal which so completely reflects the fortress mentality of its military. The possibility of unannounced "suspicion monitoring" for chemical weapons was discussed there. The Soviets insisted that in each case the other side must present a "justified inquiry" and that an international control commission would then decide where and how checks would be made. So much for the subject of "surprise suspicion monitoring."

Schabanov's IZVESTIYA article revealed just what is to be expected from Gorbachev's propaganda offer concerning verification: nothing. The value of Soviet disarmament offers always decreases in the area of adequacy of monitoring if one digs deeply enough. The infuriating thing about it is the naivete of the Western public which takes the offers of Kremlin leaders at face value and thus deliberately ignores how the second level--often publicly--restricts what was said. People do not hear it because they do not wish to hear it.

#### Lothar Ruehl's Analysis

Bonn RHEINISCHER MERKUR/CHRIST UND WELT in German 26 April 86 p 3

[Article by Lothar Ruehl, State Secretary in the FRG Ministry of Defense: "Gorbachev Must Follow Up With Action: An Analysis of Moscow's Most Recent Disarmament Proposals for Conventional Troop Reduction"; first paragraph is RHEINISCHER MERKUR/CHRIST UND WELT introduction]

[Text] Mikhail Gorbachev, himself not yet completely established in the network of Kremlin power, has been carrying out a remarkable propaganda campaign directed at the West for months. After the proposals for total nuclear disarmament by the year 2000 presented on 15 January, Gorbachev has now gone to the public on 18 April, during the SED party congress, with a new grandiose sounding plan for the reduction of conventional troops in Europe "from the Atlantic to the Urals" (a De Gaulle expression!). The West has always called for progress in the area of conventional disarmament as a flanking step for the reduction of the nuclear arsenal because that is where the overwhelming superior strength of the East is particularly obvious. Whereas the United States answered Gorbachev's January proposals at the end of February, there has still been no concrete Western response to the most recent push. In the following, Lothar Ruehl, Habilitatus PhD and State Secretary in the FRG Ministry of Defense, examines what requires careful attention in this Kremlin offer.

Mikhail Gorbachev's most recent offers of 18 April in East Berlin are obviously supposed to fill in the gaps in his previous disarmament proposals. The offer is vague but interesting. It includes demands and ideas of the West

for negotiation results in Vienna on bilateral troop reduction in Central Europe, in Stockholm for the creation of trust and disarmament in all of Europe, and in Geneva for the inclusion of short-range ballistic weapons in parity restrictions. The fundamental characteristic of these proposals which need interpretation and amendment is that with them Gorbachev raises more questions than he answers.

#### For a New Balance of Forces Between the Atlantic and the Urals

Therefore the first task of the East-West discussions on all relevant themes is to define the subjects and principles for negotiation. This is especially valid for the issue of whether "a meaningful reduction of all components of the land forces and tactical air forces of the European states as well as the corresponding U.S. and Canadian forces stationed in Europe" (Gorbachev) is to include all Soviet land and tactical air forces in the European portion of the USSR as a starting point. The expression that the area included in the reduction should include "all Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals" permits, in fact, no other interpretation. This means that some two-thirds of all Soviet land and air forces and the "strategic tactical" rocket troops with ranges between 100 and 1000 kilometers would have to be included in the negotiations.

Expressed numerically that means:

- 1.4 million soldiers in the land forces and the tactical air forces
- 135 combat divisions
- 40,000 combat tanks
- 35,000 guns over 100 mm and rocket launchers
- 4,600 fighter planes of the tactical air forces
- 1,200 strategic tactical rockets

This magnitude reflects the problem of the reduction of the Warsaw Pact's conventional superiority in Europe: In order to create a balanced relationship of forces between the West and the East the Soviet Union would have to make the greatest contribution to the reduction of these forces, for otherwise a reduction of its military superiority could not be achieved.

Gorbachev's 18 April speech contains no indication of a Soviet willingness to do this. "Meaningful" reductions, as Gorbachev calls them, could be proportional to the troop strength of each country and therefore unequal, without balancing the difference between the troop strength of the East and the West. Therefore, the Western premises in the Vienna negotiations on joint troop reduction in Europe are not "proportional," but rather "asymmetric." The starting point is the excess on the Eastern side.

Gorbachev's intentions need clarification also concerning the method of accounting: "All European countries" also includes the neutral countries of Yugoslavia, Switzerland, Sweden, Austria, and Finland. How and where are their forces to be figured in?

The MBFR [Mutual Balanced Forces Reduction] negotiations on East-West troop reduction, which has as its object a concrete military-political security relationship, i.e., Central Europe in a geographically limited area between NATO and the Warsaw Pact, is based on comparable military characteristics with

defined goals--mutual maximum strengths. A negotiation based on "Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals" would have to be carried out on the basis of the military reference quantities of the East-West force relationship since all countries would have to participate without regard to their geographic location, their relationship to an alliance, and the size and type of their forces. In such a negotiation, how is a mutual standard of security through reduction of forces to be agreed upon? Would security in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals become any greater if the forces of all countries including the American forces stationed in Europe are reduced by an equal percentage--10 percent or 30 percent? How are such reductions to be tallied up as a militarily sensible relationship between potential enemies?

This is especially valid for the major weapons systems which give the forces their fighting strength, striking and defensive capability, and their mobility: fighter planes, combat tanks, guns, tactical vehicles, and ballistic weapons.

How are physical distribution, distance and range of possible targets on each enemy side, reinforcement capabilities, mobilization ability, and also reserves and ordnance depots to be taken into consideration? These factors do not lend themselves to change according to the same measurements without altering the makeup of forces and their logistical infrastructure.

These observations point to the basic question: that of monitoring compliance with commitments. How can these be verified effectively, constantly, and reliably? In this regard, Gorbachev even took on-site inspections into consideration "if necessary," but also spoke of "national technical means," i.e., remote reconnaissance means. Without a system for international monitoring, effective verification is inconceivable. This is also valid for a "chemical-free zone in Europe," which should not be limited to parts of Europe anyway if it is supposed to produce increased security. Western proposals go much farther on this issue than those of the East because they are aimed at verifiable elimination of all chemical weapons and their production sites worldwide--the only sure solution to the problem.

In fact, in connection with chemical weapons, the Soviet stance has previously been ambiguous in the matter of controls: "Controls based on suspicion" such as those demanded by the Western side must be "justified" and "examined" before they can be carried out. It remains to be seen whether effective and verifiable commitments will result from the continuing negotiations in Geneva dealing with chemical weapons and in Vienna dealing with verification of troop reductions. In this same regard, it remains to be determined what Soviet Deputy Defense Minister Schabanov means in IZVESTIYA by his restrictive remarks on "reasonable" control measures; in any event, Gorbachev's proposal on this major point seems already to be qualified.

#### Moscow's Offensive Capability Must Not Be Retained

The conclusive indication of the willingness to give a militarily significant Europe an increase in more stable, i.e., more crisis-proof, security against military threats would be the elimination of the offensive structure of the

Soviet forces and of the Warsaw Pact, especially in Central Europe. Here the Soviet military power holds a striking establishment with superior force which gives it the option to invade Western Europe by undertaking expansion of reinforcements and western movement of troops out of Russia.

Therefore the Vienna troop reduction negotiations will remain the testing ground for Soviet willingness to disarm in Europe. Furthermore, the Soviet Union can demonstrate in Stockholm whether it is actually willing to open up to international trustworthiness in its European section and to reduce the conventional strike force of its military machine over the western front in Central Europe so that it no longer oppresses Europe.

Soviet diplomacy must contribute to the negotiations on the security of Europe with concrete offers of long overdue concessions for mutual advantage. Only in this way can the content and consequences of Gorbachev's words be tested.

#### Proposals Seen Aimed at Soviet Bureaucracy

Hamburg DIE ZEIT in German 2 May 86 p 5

[Article by Christoph Bertram: "The Man Wants To Talk; Mikhail Gorbachev's Disarmament Package, Not Simple Propaganda, But No Finalized Plan Either"]

[Text] If the Soviet general secretary had the intention to make both Western politicians and Soviet bureaucrats equally insecure with his cascade of disarmament proposals, he clearly succeeded. In Western chancelleries the experts are puzzling over what induced the Soviet party leader to nudge the admittedly sterile disarmament debate out of its beaten path with repeated new advances--pure propaganda or a sincere willingness to negotiate. And in the places where the test can actually be run on the sample, i.e., in the East-West negotiations in progress from Stockholm to Vienna and Geneva, Soviet diplomats have so far shown little willingness to match their leader's grand words with commensurate actions.

"The minimalists are at work," an experienced Western diplomat assesses the behavior of his Soviet colleagues--a judgment which could have been generated by the reaction of many a Western government, not just the one in Washington. In fact, it would suit the bureaucratic blockheads in the East and the political hawks in the West if Gorbachev's melodious disarmament offensive would quickly fizzle due to lack of substance. The Kremlin leader is therefore taking quite a risk. If he does not succeed in closing the gap between his pronouncements in the public forum and the actions of his representatives in secret negotiations, his credibility will be jeopardized--at home as well as abroad.

#### Moscow's Old Refusal

This is becoming especially clear in an area which has increasingly become a touchstone for arms control for the West in recent years, which however has been and remains to be a hot potato for the Soviets: The monitoring of



agreements, called verification in disarmament jargon. Recurring like a refrain in Gorbachev's package of proposals of 15 January 1986 was the willingness, in the interest of arms control, finally to tone down the old Soviet refusal to allow foreign observers to peek at their military cards.

The three-stage plan for total nuclear disarmament would be extensively monitored, both with national technological means (such as satellite reconnaissance) and with on-site inspections. "The USSR is ready to agree to any additional monitoring measures." In the proposal for an agreement to a test ban he says, "Monitoring is no problem for us." If there were a space weapons ban, Gorbachev would also be ready for "the most stringent monitoring, including the opening of relevant laboratories for inspection." For the destruction of chemical weapons and the shutting down of the corresponding manufacturing sites, he demands a "new view of things" and promises "strong controls, including international on-site inspection." And the general secretary even promises to remove the stumbling block in the Vienna negotiations of how possible troop movements could be monitored: "We start from the premise that eventual agreement on troop reduction naturally requires reasonable oversight. We are prepared to accept that." In addition to national means, "permanent monitoring positions could be established which would monitor the movement of any troop contingents in the reduction zone."

In the doldrums of the negotiations, so far only a breeze can be felt from this fresh gust of wind from the general secretary. With the most recent Soviet proposals for the proscription of chemical weapons, which were presented last week at the Geneva disarmament conference, the willingness for a permanent international team of inspectors is in fact confirmed. But the international watchdogs are only to work jointly with national inspectors and then only if agreed to in individual cases by the country under suspicion: Hence suspicion monitoring only with the consent of the suspect!

In the Vienna negotiations on troop reduction in Europe there is also still very little trace of "the new view of things." To be sure, the Soviet negotiators have agreed to controls, but only of a sort that can control very little. At the beginning of April, Robert Blackwell, chief of the American delegation, described the Soviet position as "a bad joke": "The good news is that the East is ready to install permanent observation posts. The bad news is that virtually no Soviet troops would have to pass them to enter or leave the troop reduction zone"--in particular not the approximately 200,000 Soviet soldiers who are exchanged annually among the allies in East Europe and the USSR.

So, what are Gorbachev's intentions with his proposals? Are they only propaganda? Or is there a sincere design for disarmament behind them?

Probably neither assessment is totally accurate. Of course, gems of propaganda are part of the craft and are conspicuous again in the latest proposals. That is particularly true of the noble vision of an atom-free world by the year 2000: No one, not even Mikhail Gorbachev, can seriously believe that atomic weapons can be un-discovered, the genie sealed back in the bottle. But only propaganda? After all, not only did the most important man

in the Soviet Union preach a message of general salvation, but he became almost unnecessarily concrete into the bargain. He is, unlike his predecessors, willing to completely eliminate the SS-20 rockets in exchange for Pershing II's and cruise missiles. He thus sanctions the Western arms buildup in retrospect. He wants to negotiate about medium-range weapons in Europe even if the United States insists on its Star Wars plans. He agrees with Ronald Reagan's demand for deep cuts in the strategic arsenal--the Soviets brusquely rejected a similar proposal from Jimmy Carter in March 1977. He declares himself ready to reduce troops not only in East Europe but also in the European part of the Soviet Union--this, as if former Soviet governments had not insisted that Soviet territory was exempt from the Vienna negotiations. With all of these new statements, the new Kremlin chief did not abandon any central Soviet positions. However, he did declare arguments outmoded that his predecessors once considered inscribed in concrete. That is more than was necessary for mere propaganda, and certainly more than is suitable to many in the Moscow apparatus.

### Still Much That Is Unfinished

On the contrary: Gorbachev did not in any case present a unified disarmament plan. There is still too much which is unfinished. And with all his flexibility, the Soviet party chief holds unwaveringly to positions which are already assured of uncompromising rejection from the West. For the present, there is absolutely no hint that the gap might be bridged. That is not true merely for space weapons, which President Reagan will not give up. Gorbachev wants to make the elimination of the SS-20's dependent on a freeze of the modest British and French rocket arsenals, although England and France have clearly rejected this for a long time. The old Soviet demand that "strategic offensive weapons" must include all American systems, even short-range rockets and airplanes, which threaten Soviet territory will be presented again this time, as it has been every time since 1969, although the United States always rejects it.

There is also the fact, surprising to many in the West, that the Kremlin leader is obviously making his proposals without their having been completely thought out and formulated in all details. SPD representative Egon Bahr, who called on Gorbachev's chief foreign affairs adviser Dobrynin last week, was told concerning the most recent offers about reduction of conventional troops that work is still in progress in Moscow to fill out the framework set up by Gorbachev. And when Western diplomats in the current forums on East-West arms control fished for information from their Soviet colleagues about what the most important man in the Kremlin might have meant by this or that public expression, they frequently came up against embarrassed silence. It is obvious that there is not only often a lack of clear instructions from headquarters but also of clarity at headquarters itself.

But what is Gorbachev's goal with his mixture of visions, partial concessions, and old positions? In all likelihood the general secretary's strategy is shaped by a whole assortment of motives.

First: Gorbachev is not counting on a quick outcome of negotiations. The price which Washington is demanding is too high for him. As long as the

United States holds on to its SDI program, as long as Ronald Reagan refuses to give priority to arms control at the next summit, according to Gorbachev, nothing will happen.

Second: Independently of negotiations, the Kremlin chief wants to free Soviet positions from all the hardening and entrenchment that have increased there in recent years and now restrict Soviet negotiating room. The Moscow design for disarmament ought to become more conclusive and more convincing. For now, Gorbachev can produce a positive reaction in Western public opinion for it; in the future, he can perhaps enter negotiations with a better chance of success. And because the reform of Soviet disarmament policy would quickly smother in the encrusted Moscow apparatus, Gorbachev is trying to establish its general direction through public pronouncements from above--as he did in his economic policy. There is time for the details later.

Third: The general secretary wants to slow down Western armament policy at least through offers if he cannot yet limit it through treaties. In the security policy discussions of the West there will always be the possibility that there is the alternative of arms control instead of new armament: the offer of radical reduction instead of new American strategic weapons, the offer of regional and worldwide elimination of chemical weapons instead of new ones; the offer of a test moratorium instead of the development of killer satellites in space, the alternative of abolition of all "strategic tactical" missiles instead of the consideration of a West European defense against Soviet short-range rockets. The Soviet Union, Gorbachev well knows, needs quiet on the armament front in order to nurse its economy to health. Although the price for an agreement with the West may currently be too high, Western armament plans can at least be slowed down through offers which appeal to the public.

The strategy has its risks. Gorbachev's initiatives could meet with increasing skepticism in Western public opinion if no action follows all this talk. In the United States Gorbachev's public diplomacy has already triggered annoyance and reinforced the hawks, who already consider the whole thing a pure propaganda maneuver. And in the bureaucratic-military complex of the Soviet Union the opposition to the top-level advances could become insurmountable if Gorbachev's initiatives fail to produce any positive Western reaction.

So the Soviet party chief needs the help of Western governments. With continually renewed Western rebuffs--as for example with the proposal for an atomic test ban--Gorbachev's room to maneuver becomes limited from the domestic side as well. Only if the West picks up on one or another idea, probes it, and does not recoil from rethinking some of its own beloved ideas, will the Soviet leadership and its bureaucracy be required to flesh out the still vague designs of its party chief. And vice versa: The advocates of arms control in the West need Gorbachev. For without his proposals the prospects for possible agreements would be even more dismal than they are now. The man at least wants to be talked to.

How many partners the general secretary has in Moscow for his plans he himself knows best. There are certainly not many in the West: The United States does

not think much of his proposals. France and Great Britain are holding back on account of the continued Soviet attempt to prune back their atomic weapons indirectly. For the FRG, Minister of Foreign Affairs Genscher said in the current session of the Bundestag concerning the most recent Kremlin initiative: "We are taking the Soviet proposals seriously and believe that the possibilities of a new phase in West-East relationships should not be neglected." The entire FRG government should seize this even though the Soviet Union has so far shown little willingness to win the FRG over to its plans. On the contrary: In Gorbachev's speech to the SED party congress in which he conveyed his latest disarmament initiative the policies of the FRG government were again reprimanded. Also it is questionable whether the Kremlin chief already has a complete strategy or is still working only on the blueprints. The latter would seem likely. Because the tempo that Mikhail Gorbachev has set makes it easy to forget that he has been in office for scarcely less than a year. Whoever wants to test Gorbachev's sincerity should not hold him too strictly to time limits.

12666

CSO: 5200/2686

## NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

### LOWN MESSAGE HAILS TEST MORATORIUM EXTENSION

PM201520 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 May 86 First Edition p 1

["Message From Prof B. Lown"--PRAVDA headline]

[Text] Esteemed General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev! On behalf of the "International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War" movement I salute and congratulate you on the announcement of the extension of the Soviet moratorium on nuclear tests. You have performed an act of unprecedented statesmanship. Our movement, which includes physicians from 41 countries, pledges to redouble its efforts to persuade the U.S. Government to follow your example and thus ensure the establishment of a mutual Soviet-American moratorium, which could lead to the conclusion of a lasting treaty on a general and total ban on nuclear weapon tests. We believe that a mutual moratorium meets the security interests of the Soviet Union, the United States, and all the countries of the world.

As you know, Mr General Secretary, the "International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War" movement and its national branches have long emphasized that a test moratorium is the most promising strategy in the disarmament sphere. Scientists all over the world agree that a Soviet-American test moratorium would be easy to verify. In an age of distrust it is a measure that does not require trust. The halting of tests would hinder the creation of new, destabilizing arms systems. It would accord with earlier commitments, in particular those directed against tests and the provisions of the Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons. It would graphically demonstrate to the whole world the seriousness of the two major powers' intention to reverse the nuclear arms race. It would not adversely affect the security interests of either the Soviet Union or the United States. In fact, in a nuclear age Americans and Soviet people share the same destiny and a Soviet-American moratorium on tests, which would be observed right up to the conclusion of a treaty on a general and total ban on nuclear weapon tests, is a joint and mutual step forward.

Respectfully, Bernard Lown, cochairman of the "International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War" movement.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1410

## NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR: PHYSICIANS AGAINST NUCLEAR WAR CONGRESS URGES TEST BAN

### Gorbachev Message

LD291952 Moscow World Service in English 1000 GMT 29 May 86

[Text] A world congress of the movement International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War has opened in Cologne, Federal Germany. It's attended by over 3,000 delegates from more than 50 countries. The co-chairman of the movement, Soviet cardiologist Yevgeniy Chazov, conveyed greetings from the general secretary of the Soviet Communist Party's Central Committee, Mikhail Gorbachev, to the applause of the participants. The Soviet leader singled out the great international authority of the movement. The message says that by explaining the disastrous consequences of nuclear war to the public, doctors direct people at energetically counteracting those who don't want to realize the threat looming over every family in a nuclear age. The Soviet leader stressed that the noble efforts of medical workers in the struggle against the ghost of the last epidemic has won them respect everywhere. Mikhail Gorbachev wished the delegates success in their work for general benefit.

### Lown, Rau Addresses

LD291200 Moscow TASS in English 1156 GMT 29 May 86

[Text] Cologne May 29 TASS -- By TASS correspondent Gennadiy Kulbitskiy:

The participants in the movement International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War can take pride in their considerable accomplishments.

For millions of people on earth, they have dispelled the fog of ignorance and impelled them to ponder seriously over the heinous realities of nuclear war, Professor Bernard Lown has pointed out.

He addressed the 6th World Congress of International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, which opened here today, on behalf of the Soviet and American co-presidents of the movement.

Dr. Lown said that broad sections of the world public were presented with a list of baneful effects of the use of nuclear weapons. More and more people were convinced that medicine could do nothing to help nuclear war victims or even alleviate their suffering.

Introducing a moratorium on all nuclear explosions was adopted by members of the international movement of physicians as the first medical prescription, he said. The moratorium could be verified even by national means up to the blast yield of less than one kiloton.

The movement was persistently striving for the implementation of this top-priority task, Dr Lown said. That was why, he noted, that the physicians welcomed the Soviet Union's suspension of nuclear tests from August 6 to December 31, 1985.

To achieve a real success, however, it was necessary that the United States reciprocate. The West's response to the Soviet initiative caused disappointment within the ranks of the movement.

Dr Lown highly assessed the Soviet Union's decision to extend its unilateral moratorium on any nuclear blasts till the next "Hiroshima Day" -- August 6, 1986.

"I back the demand for an end to nuclear weapons testing," Johannes Rau, minister president of North Rhine-Westphalia State (Federal Republic of Germany) and leading SPD [Social Democratic Party] chancellor candidate, told the congress.

"The decision to end any nuclear explosions is simultaneously a test of the seriousness of one's intentions to put an end to the arms race. The termination of testing should be followed by other comprehensive disarmament steps.

I see no more obstacles to ending nuclear weapons tests after the Soviet Union unilaterally suspended nuclear explosions and expressed its readiness for international control."

The plenary session was addressed by New Zealand's Prime Minister David Lange who came out in favour of ending the nuclear arms race.

Concluding a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty, leading to the limitation of the growth of nuclear weapons arsenals, he said, would become a considerable contribution to curbing the arms race.

Mankind possessed technologies, he pointed out, that allowed verification of the treaty. The only roadblock to concluding it was the absence of political will.

## Lessons of Chernobyl

LD301601 Moscow TASS in English 1527 GMT 30 May 86

[Text] Cologne May 30 TASS--By TASS correspondent Gennadiy Kulbitskiy:

The 6th World Congress of International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW) is continuing its work here.

Physicians and other health workers from more than fifty countries, and numerous guests, who arrived in this major industrial and cultural centre of the Federal Republic of Germany, started debates on concrete and urgent topics concerned with the further invigoration of their campaign for the prevention of nuclear war.

The art of physicians will be totally irrelevant and any means of medicine ineffective in case of a thermonuclear catastrophe to which mankind is being pushed by aggressive U.S. and NATO circles.

That is why the chief task of the IPPNW movement is to campaign vigorously against the mounting threat of nuclear war, for ridding mankind of nuclear armaments.

This idea keynoted most of the speeches made by the delegates to the congress.

The delegates expressed their profound concern over the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant. Their statements expressed understanding of the misfortune that struck the USSR, and respect for the Soviet people, including Soviet physicians for their selfless work on resolving the complicated and diverse tasks of overcoming the consequences of the accident. The speakers expressed sincere sympathy and support.

That tragic event, said a statement of the IPPNW movement, unanimously adopted by the delegates, confirmed the correctness of the warning long since made by the movement: medicine would be powerless even if only a few warheads exploded.

There was no nuclear explosion in Chernobyl, still all of Europe was affected. The news of the Chernobyl accident impelled members of the movement to step up their campaign against nuclear war with all means at their disposal.

Nuclear war would become the last tragedy, the statement said, reminding physicians all over the world of their professional duty to try to avert the great threat to very life on earth.

Reactionary press bodies in the Federal Republic sought to use the developments in Chernobyl to try and split the international movement of physicians.

The newspaper DIE WELT, a mouthpiece of the reactionary circles, prophesied "collapse" of the congress in connection with the Chernobyl accident.

Professor Bernard Lown (USA), co-president of the IPPNW, told the TASS correspondent that various views of the atomic power plant accident in the USSR were being made at the congress. "Despite that, the congress is a success."



Dr. Lown said it was necessary to counter any attempts to use the tragic event for anti-Soviet purposes. "Chernobyl is our common misfortune. That is why the demand for a moratorium on all nuclear explosions and a call on the U.S. Administration to follow the USSR's example are so timely today."

The West German section of the IPPNW today submitted for consideration to the workshop "Atomic Energy" a document entitled "Time to Awaken". It appealed to the politicians to "apply maximum efforts for the immediate termination of nuclear weapon tests worldwide, and for the establishment of a zone in Europe that would be free of nuclear and chemical weapons. [no closing quotation marks as received]

A discussion on the role of journalists in preventing nuclear war was held today for the first time in the history of world congresses of the movement. Mass media representatives from the USSR, the United States, Britain, West Germany, Hungary and other countries took part.

During the interesting and sometimes keen debate, the journalists considered in detail the questions of responsibility of journalists and their contribution to the common cause of mankind -- that of preserving peace on earth.

Many people took part in the debate. Western journalists were asked many questions concerning their reluctance to devote more materials to the broadening anti-war movement, including the international movement of physicians.

#### Appeal To U.S., USSR

LD011449 Moscow TASS in English 1304 GMT 1 Jun 86

[Text] Cologne June 1 TASS -- TASS correspondent Gennadiy Kulbitskiy reports:

The Sixth International Congress of the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War movement ended here today. The congress brought together more than 3,000 delegates and guests from over 50 countries.

The participants in the congress adopted an appeal to the Soviet and U.S. leadership, emphasizing the imperative need for the United States to join the moratorium on all nuclear explosions, announced by the Soviet Union, and also for conducting without delay talks on banning tests. The moratorium on nuclear blasts will bridle the driving force of the arms race, block the development of more and more sophisticated, accurate, compact and destabilizing first strike weapons, which it becomes increasingly more difficult to control.

The governments of the USSR and the United States, two powerful countries of the world, bear special responsibility to the entire mankind in the cause of banning nuclear tests -- the first step on the road to eliminating nuclear weapons from arsenals, the appeal says. To give concrete expression to your responsibility to the future generations and protect the health of the present generations, above all children, we call you to take the following steps:

-- To guarantee the allocation of resources for the immunization of all children on earth by the year 1990, which is the objective of the World Health Organization and the U.N. Childrens' Fund.

-- To earmark part of the funds released in the process of disarmament for health protection programmes in the interests of the children in the developing countries,

-- To exclude the development of space arms and to invest funds instead in the medical communication programme so as to make the achievements of medicine accessible to the whole of mankind.

The appeal says that it is within the capabilities of the Soviet Union and the United States to effect these measures. In the International Year of Peace these two countries can demonstrate that science and technology which follows it serve one goal solely, namely, to improve life on earth rather than threaten it with extinction.

A message to six leaders -- participants in the initiative of five continents -- supports their point of view as regards banning nuclear explosions. A mutual Soviet-U.S. moratorium, to which you called in your joint messages to U.S. President Ronald Reagan and the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev, is the measure of limiting armaments on which the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War movement focussed all its attention last year, it says.

The concluding session of the international congress approved one more document -- a medical recipe of the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War. It says that on July 1, 1985, the members of this movement have come up with a medical recipe which makes it possible to do away with the most awesome threat to human health. They urgently called for announcing immediately a moratorium on all nuclear blasts as a first indispensable step towards reversing the nuclear arms race. The International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War come up once again with this medical recipe and urge the governments of the United States and all other nuclear powers to join the USSR and announce a moratorium on nuclear weapons tests. The positive aspects of this medical recipe for averting a nuclear war are obvious.

Addressing the concluding session, Academician Yevgeniy Chazov of the USSR, co-chairman of the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War movement, said: "The USSR and the United States, other Western and Eastern countries could use satellites to develop not a military system but a system which would enable any doctor in any country of the world to receive any information and consultation for the sake of saving human life. And which is the main thing, this will be an example of what the countries across the world can do if they pool their efforts in combatting diseases, hunger and illiteracy.

This will be our best answer to those who are keen on sowing enmity and hatred among us and going ahead in these conditions with the nuclear arms race. We cannot sit on our hands, we do not have the right to be silent."

The next international congress of the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War will be held in Moscow next year.

## Press Conference

LD031732 Moscow TASS in English 1718 GMT 3 Jun 86

[Text] Moscow June 3 TASS -- Existence of nuclear arsenals are incompatible with human life. Each person must comprehend this idea, said Professor Bernard Lown (USA), a co-president of the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War. He spoke at a press conference today in Moscow on the results of the Cologne congress of this movement, which has just ended and which was attended by 4,600 medics from 59 countries.

The Cologne meeting has shown that doctors attach special importance to the moral aspect of the nuclear danger, Lown went on to say, it is incomprehensible how it was possible to stockpile so much genocide weapons. They will make no distinction between grownups and children, sick and healthy people, will destroy all mankind, he pointed out.

Our actions are aimed at bringing the opinion of doctors about the deadly danger of the nuclear arms drive to the world public. The prohibition of nuclear tests is the main idea of the explanatory programme undertaken by our movement, Lown underlined. Following the FRG and the USSR, the movement's leaders will visit China and Japan. We shall go to Hiroshima, Lown said, which was the first victim of nuclear bombing where it is inscribed on the grave of the dead: "Sleep in peace, the error will not be repeated."

The Cologne congress issued a "prescription" for saving mankind whose essence is to stop immediately nuclear tests, noted Soviet Academician Gevgeniy Chazov, the second co-president of the movement. The task of peace advocates is to prod the U.S. Administration to join the Soviet nuclear tests moratorium.

The Chernobyl tragedy serves as a formidable warning of the nuclear danger, said Chazov. The explosion of steam with a radioactive release struck 299 people with radiation disease, 23 of them are dead. But we should remember that one megaton nuclear bomb alone can take the toll of at least 300,000 lives. In case of a nuclear war, destruction threatens every citizen of the world, and any medical assistance will be useless and totally ineffective.

The Cologne congress proposed an idea of holding regional symposiums of doctors: European -- in Madrid, Latin American -- in Havana, similar meetings will be held in Washington and New Zealand.

## USSR's Chazov Interviewed

LD022337 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1953 GMT 2 Jun 86

[Text] Moscow, 2 Jun (TASS) -- The so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative" being put forward by the U.S. Administration will greatly increase the probability of nuclear conflict, said chairman of the Soviet Committee of the Physicians of the World for Prevention of Nuclear War movement Academician Gevgeniy Chazov.

Upon his return to Moscow today from Cologne (FRG) where the 6th Congress of the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War organization has ended, he gave an interview to the TASS correspondent at the steps of the plane.

The congress participants, the Soviet scientist said, stressed that according to the conclusions of specialists, a total nuclear war would mean the end of civilization. The explosion of charges of 10,000 megatons strength will immediately kill 1.15 billion people and injure 1.095 billion.

Radioactive fallout will provoke cancerous disease and genetic defects among millions of people. It will be centuries before the possibility emerges of the restoration of social and economic life.

The participants in the congress welcomed the Soviet Union's extension of the moratorium on nuclear explosions until 6 August, Yevgeniy Chazov said. If the American Administration joined the USSR's initiative, it would reliably impede the perfection of nuclear weapons because not one new model of weapons is accepted without testing the warhead that it will deliver to its target.

"That is why we consider that the main task of the peace champions is to induce the American Administration to join the Soviet moratorium," Yevgeniy Chazov concluded.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1410

## NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

### TASS INTERVIEWS U.S. PROTESTOR AT NEVADA TEST SITE

LD211937 Moscow TASS in English 1754 GMT 21 May 86

[Text] New York May 21 TASS--TASS correspondent Antoliy Lazarev reporting.

We have spent three days on the territory of the nuclear test range in Nevada in a bid to head off another nuclear device test, code-named Panamint, Larry Tasaday, one of the people who took part in the daring action of protest, told the TASS correspondent in a telephone interview.

Four more activists from the Rocky Mountain peace center took part in the protest.

Unfortunately, he went on to say, we could not attain our aim: The police arrested us on charges of trespassing on federal property.

We were put in jail outside the nuclear test range but later released on bail, Tasaday said.

Our action is called upon to encourage other Americans to stage actions of protest against the mad policy of the Reagan administration which continues the nuclear arms buildup and conducts nuclear weapon tests for that purpose, the anti-war campaigner emphasized.

Such demonstrations are all the more urgent and important since the Soviet Union extended its unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests till August 6, 1986. We believe that this is a critical time for Washington, the time when the sincerity of its statements concerning the 'striving for peace' will be put to the test.

The United States should join in the Soviet moratorium, Larry Tasaday emphasized.

He said he regarded that move as a first step toward ridding mankind of the threat of nuclear war and toward the abolition of nuclear weapons the world over.

Many Americans, he said, support the Soviet initiative and believe that it is a manifestation of true humanism of the Soviet state. We share the well-founded concern of the government and the people of the USSR over the intensifying arms race and the continuing nuclear testing. Despite arrests, we will carry on with our efforts to ensure a peaceful future for the world, Larry Tasaday said.

/8309

CSO: 5200/1410

## RELATED ISSUES

TASS: POSSIBILITY OF WINNING WAR GUIDES U.S. STRATEGY

LD041745 Moscow TASS in English 1727 GMT 4 Jun 86

[Text] Moscow June 4 TASS -- TASS Military News Analyst Vladimir Chernyshev writes:

Of late, the U.S. Administration has taken a number of steps obviously designed to whip up the arms race in every way, to heighten international tension, and deliberately to worsen Soviet-U.S. relations. Karsten Voigt, a prominent figure of the Social Democratic Party of Germany (SPD), has described as a 'black day' to disarmament May 22, when when NATO's military bodies at Washington' bidding took a decision sanctioning the start of the production of a new-generation chemical weapon in the USA -- the binary round. The same definition can be given also of May 27 when President Reagan announced a virtual refusal of the United States to be bound subsequently by the limits of the Soviet-U.S. treaty documents on the limitation of strategic offensive arms -- the 1972 interim agreement and the 1979 SALT-2 treaty.

The U.S. 'star wars' machine is gathering momentum. Nuclear explosions which are conducted one after another in Nevada sound like an overt challenge to the peoples of all continents.

By destroying the foundation of the process of limiting and reducing arms and by breaking the material curbs on the arms race, Washington enhances the nuclear and chemical threat to the world and is preparing a 'star wars' threat for it. The egoistic, imperial ambitions of the U.S. military-industrial complex are now placed by the present U.S. Administration above the interests of mankind. The administration did not reduce any of the arms programs. In point of fact it has galvanized all the military programs of previous administrations, the programmes which were removed from the agenda for some or other reasons. The U.S. administration has worked out and begun to implement an all-embracing programme for the construction of powerful arms in all the components of the U.S. strategic "triad". The U.S. President has just sent to Congress a message demanding full support for the Administration's budget request for the 1987 fiscal year intended for the implementation of the programmes for the 'strategic modernization' of America. The sum requested by the Administration (320,000 million dollars) is known to have been cut by the Senate down to 301,000 million dollars and by the House of Representatives -- down 285,000 million dollars. This gave rise to strong discontent in the White House and the Pentagon. They do not intend to put up even with such cuts inconsiderable as they are as compared with the overall amount of the requested military expenditures.

The U.S. administration needs a huge military budget in order to go ahead at an accelerated pace with the realisation of programmes for the militarisation of outer space, for "chemical rearmament" of America, of the development and deployment of new strategic offensive arms -- "MX and "Midgetman" ICBM's, heavy bombers with cruise missiles on board. "Trident" missile-carrying submarines, and so on.

All these actions by Washington are in obvious contradiction with the important provisions recorded in the joint Soviet-U.S. document on the results of the summit meeting in Geneva, and first of all, with the pledge not to seek military superiority, and the statement that nuclear war cannot be won and should never be fought.

Instead, all the above-mentioned actions of the U.S. Administration are closely dovetailed with the 'counter-vailing' strategy between the USA and the USSR, the strategy which the administration announced in June 1981. Those actions indicate that, despite the peaceable rhetoric of the U.S. leadership, the White House and the Pentagon are still guided by precisely that strategy which admits of a possibility of winning a victory in a nuclear war and of achieving military superiority over the Soviet Union.

It is time, at last, for the U.S. leadership to abandon its intentions to continue to threaten mankind with a nuclear sword and to keep the world in the trap of [word indistinct]-out destruction. It is time to take a sober view of the realities of the nuclear and space age. The U.S. side should cherish no illusions that it will manage to achieve military advantages for itself at the expense of the security of others. It is time to get over the gulf separating myths from reality and to move on from destruction to creation.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1414

## RELATED ISSUES

### CPSU'S VOROTNIKOV ON U.S. RESPONSE TO SOVIET INITIATIVES

PM021102 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 May 86 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Comrade V.I. Vorotnikov's Speech"]

[Excerpts] Ulaanbatar, 28 May--Today the 19th MPRP Congress was addressed by the head of the CPSU Delegation V.I. Vorotnikov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, who was warmly greeted by those present. He said: Esteemed Comrade Batmonh! Esteemed comrades! On behalf of all our country's Communists and working people, the CPSU delegation wholeheartedly greets the 19th MPRP Congress. We wish the congress delegates successful and fruitful work.

We and our comrades-in-arms in the socialist community share the view that life demands that cooperation be not only expanded but also raised to a qualitatively new level. The CPSU declared from the rostrum of the 27th party congress its determination to do everything it can in this respect. Comrade J. Batmonh's report and the delegates' speeches at your congress confirm that this is also the consistent line pursued by the party of the Mongolian Communists. Past and present experience indicates that by pooling our efforts and strengthening our multifaceted mutual ties we augment socialism's strength and enable it to influence the course of world events more actively and counter the aggressive imperialist policy more effectively.

The need for this is felt acutely today when the situation in the world has become particularly tense and dangerous. The source of this tension is the adventurist imperialist policy. The actions of the present U.S. Administration are characterized by imperial ambitions and crude disregard for the rights of other peoples. In its desire to destroy the military-strategic equilibrium that has been established in the world arena, imperialism is escalating the arms race, preparing to extend it to space, and irresponsibly toying with the fate of millions of people.

The paramount aim of the CPSU's international activity is to provide the Soviet people and our friends and allies with the possibility of working in conditions of lasting peace and freedom and to remove the threat of a new world war that is hanging over the planet.

The fundamental principles of an all-embracing system of international security formulated by the 27th CPSU Congress are imbued with profound concern for peace and reflect a truly constructive approach to the complex problems of international life. Fulfilling the behest of the congress, we will continue to struggle with unrelenting energy for the implementation of the comprehensive program for the elimination of mass destruction weapons, put forward in the statement of Comrade M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, of 15 January this year.



Of late our country has advanced a number of specific new proposals relating to arms limitation and disarmament, the strengthening of security in Europe, and the Soviet-American talks in Geneva. As you know, speaking on Soviet television recently, Comrade M.S. Gorbachev announced the extension of our unilateral moratorium on nuclear weapon tests until 6 August. Throughout the world this step was received as yet another convincing manifestation of our sincere concern for the fate of peace and our desire to avert the threat of nuclear war.

All the Soviet Union's actions are imbued with a striving for mutually acceptable and honest accords that would take the interests of both sides into account. We are seeking no advantages for ourselves and we are not trying to outwit our partner.

Unfortunately, the U.S. Administration and its NATO allies are not reciprocating. No matter what proposals we put forward, they are immediately rejected, for which any far-fetched pretext is considered suitable. Instead of a constructive attitude toward our proposals, counterproposals are put forward that pursue unilateral advantages in the military-strategic sphere and complicate the quest for accords.

In other words, comrades, the U.S. Administration does not want serious talks, it does not want a relaxation of tension, it does not want disarmament. This is graphically borne out also by the recent provocative and defiant actions of the U.S. military in various parts of the world, the proliferation of efforts aimed at the militarization of space, their aggression against Libya, their unceasing provocations against Central American countries, and the fueling of tension in the Near and Middle East.

However, no matter how hard they try to provoke us, we will not abandon our principled foreign policy course. We are confident that the future belongs to the policy of peace and cooperation between peoples. We are convinced that all the controversial questions which arise in international life can and must be resolved by peaceful means at the negotiating table. This, and only this approach accords with mankind's natural striving for self-preservation and with the interests of the peoples of all continents.

Here, in Ulaanbaatar, in the heart of the Asian Continent, I would like to dwell especially on the situation in the Asian and Pacific region. In this vast region there are quite a few involved political tangles and "flashpoints." It is no secret that imperialism feeds on contradictions and differences between Asian countries. It has a vested interest in Asia and the Pacific and Indian Ocean remaining a constant source of tension and a sphere of military confrontation. This is why it is kindling conflicts here.

All this is directly damaging the national interests of the peoples of the region who are seeking economic and social progress in conditions of peace, independence, and mutual cooperation. The political will to tackle long overdue problems is strengthening in Asian countries. And it seems natural that their solution should be sought by pooling the constructive efforts of all the states of the region for the common good, rather than by individual countries alone or within the framework of isolated groups of countries.

Speaking about this, I would like to note with special satisfaction the increasing activity in the region of the Mongolian People's Republic. Your peace-loving efforts are meeting with increasingly broad response. It is impossible to ignore, for instance, to what extent the idea of a convention on mutual nonaggression and nonuse of force in relations between the states of Asia and the Pacific Ocean put forward by the MPRP accords with the spirit of the times and the interests of peoples.

As for the Soviet Union, we propose a comprehensive step-by-step approach to the solution of the region's problems. It is not, of course, a question of forcing a ready-made formula of all-Asian security on anyone, but rather an invitation to take part in its joint elaboration. This path does not, of course, guarantee the immediate solution of all the problems that have accumulated in Asia. However, it will undoubtedly promote mutual understanding and facilitate the quest for accords, and it will make it possible to make confrontation in various parts of the continent less acute and to stabilize the situation there.

In our view, the principles of Bandung which have lost none of their topicality, as well as the generally known initiatives advanced by Vietnam, other fraternal Indochinese states, and India, and the Soviet proposals for confidence-building measures in the Far East can, for instance, become elements of a broad and constructive concept of security in Asia. Of great importance is the DPRK initiative aimed at improving the situation on the Korean peninsula and transforming it into a nuclear-free zone. The steps taken by the Government of Afghanistan with a view to achieving a political settlement of the situation around that country accord harmoniously with the united concept of peace on the Asian continent.

We also regard our program for the elimination of nuclear and chemical weapons by the end of the current century as a contribution to the elaboration of a common approach to the establishment of a system of secure and lasting peace in Asia. People in the Soviet Union proceed from the premise that socialist China, too, could play a significant role in the establishment of goodneighborly relations in the region.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1414

## RELATED ISSUES

### FURTHER ON NAVAL DISCUSSION AT UN DISARMAMENT COMMISSION

LD200943 Moscow TASS in English 0700 GMT 20 May 86

[Text] New York, 20 May (TASS)--The delegations of Bulgaria, the German Democratic Republic and the Soviet Union called for an early opening of talks and consultations on planning specific steps to limit the operations of naval fleets, reduce naval arms and spread confidence measures to the seas and oceans. The three delegations submitted a working document for consideration to the current session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission here. The document took note of the need for reversing the continuing escalation of the race in naval arms.

The document said in part that the delegations of Bulgaria, the German Democratic Republic and the Soviet Union welcomed the beginning of consultations on that matter in the United Nations Disarmament Commission. [word indistinct] of the urgent measure agreement could be reached on the non-expansion of naval operations of the states in the regions through which the busiest shipping routes pass and where the possibility of conflict situations is most probably--the Indian, Atlantic or Pacific oceans, the Mediterranean Sea or the Persian Gulf.

With regard to one of such regions--the Mediterranean where dangerous developments are taking place--the sides could come to terms on the application of agreed confidence measures, on the reduction of the armed forces, on the withdrawal of ships carrying nuclear weapons, on renouncing the deployment of such weapons on the territory of the non-nuclear Mediterranean countries and on the nuclear powers pledging not to use such weapons against any Mediterranean country which does not permit their deployment on its territory.

At the first phase, the document emphasized, no limitations of any kind would be imposed on the naval operations and naval arms of the Mediterranean states. As to further steps to enhance security in that region, they could be defined with due account of the Soviet proposals set forth in the 15 January statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and aiming for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons.

The People's Republic of Bulgaria, the GDR and the USSR believe that the realization of the Soviet Union-formulated nuclear disarmament program and the proposal on working out fundamental elements of a comprehensive system of international security would undoubtedly block off ways of the race in any arms, including naval arms.

The working document emphasized that if the United States withdrew its fleet from the Mediterranean Sea the same would be done simultaneously by the Soviet Union which was prepared to open talks on that matter without delay.

Such regional measures, as the transformation of the Mediterranean into a zone of stable peace and cooperation, the transformation of the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace and the implementation of measures to strengthen peace and security in the Persian Gulf would be of positive importance, the document said.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1414

## RELATED ISSUES

TASS: UN DISARMAMENT HEAD HOLDS PRESS CONFERENCE IN MOSCOW

LD261126 Moscow TASS in English 1104 GMT 26 May 86

[Text] Moscow, 26 May (TASS)--Jan Martenson, under-secretary-general of the United Nations and head of the UN department for disarmament affairs, held a press conference in Moscow today.

He recalled that in 1982 the United Nations had a second special session devoted to disarmament which launched the world disarmament campaign. The idea behind this campaign is to inform the world public about the aims and goals of the United Nations in the field examined.

The kind of ultimate goal in all this is to try to assist in creating a constructive, realistic and well-informed public opinion in all countries, that could have bearing on politicians to act in the field of disarmament.

The under-secretary-general said that in its work the United Nations had established five main constituencies. These are parliamentarians, the non-governmental organizations, the media, the research institutes and educational communities.

"We live in the extremely dangerous world... the combination of explosives... is more than one million Hiroshima bombs. We have also a dangerous situation in the field of conventional weapons. Since 1945 there have been something like 150 conflicts in the world with a death toll--the majority of whom are civilians--about 20 million people".

The annual military expenditure in the world is roughly equivalent to the entire debt burden of developing countries.

Jan Martenson expressed high appreciation of the program of complete elimination of nuclear weapons by 2000 put forward by the Soviet Union and described it as extremely important and all-embracing. He also highly appreciated the prolonging by the explosions till 6 August this year.

The UN under-secretary-general recalled that at the meeting in Geneva the Soviet and American leaders had expressed confidence that a nuclear war must never take place and that there can be no winners in it.

We should bring home this idea to the whole of mankind. Apart from it, no country can resolve its economic problems and at the same time spend enormous resources to the arms race. He pointed out the growing role of world public opinion which had turned into a powerful influential force in the struggle for peace, against a thermonuclear catastrophe.

Answering the question about the future of the United Nations organization, he emphasized that the UN was an instrument of peace. However, one should take into consideration that it is operating as effectively as it is permitted by its member states. One should not forget that the UN is the expression of the collective will of all its member states, the place where they can freely express their opinion irrespective of the size of the country. This is why he believes that there is a future for the UN.

Jan Martenson positively assessed the UN regional conference within the framework of the world disarmament campaign that was held in Tbilisi. He expressed gratitude to the Soviet Government, public organizations and the people of the USSR for assistance and cooperation.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1414

## RELATED ISSUES

### TASS ON PROPOSED UN CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT, DEVELOPMENT

LD031153 Moscow TASS in English 1052 GMT 3 Jun 86

[Text] Moscow June 3 TASS -- TASS Political News Analyst Askold Biryukov writes:

Arming instead of development or disarmament for development? This is how the question stands now in view of a prospect for the convocation of an international conference this summer on interconnection between disarmament and development. It must be recalled that a decision to call such a conference was unanimously taken at the 40th session of the U.N. General Assembly in December last year. In accordance with that decision, the conference is to consider a wide range of matters concerning the adverse effect which the on-going arms race and the growth of military expenditures have on the socio-economic situation in the world. The conference is also to set about looking for ways to release additional resources for creative purposes, particularly those in the interests of the developing countries, resultant of the implementation of disarmament measures.

A special committee began preparations for the conference and has done by now a certain amount of work in this direction.

There is no doubt that an all-round discussion at a high political level of the adverse effects of the arms race, and the problem of switching over for creative purposes the huge funds, which are now being spent on military programmes, would serve the interests of the whole of mankind, of all peoples that strive to solve their socio-economic problems. It was not fortuitous that the convocation and goals of the conference were welcomed at the April session of the Coordinating Bureau by the foreign ministers of non-aligned countries in Delhi.

They urged all countries to take part in the international conference and to contribute to its being a success.

The foreign ministers pointed out its being of particular importance to find ways to rectify the existing situation when hundreds of billions of dollars, which is equivalent to approximately \$1.5 million per minute, are spent every year on weapons, which is in sharp contrast to poverty and, in some cases, to abject poverty in which two thirds of the world's population live. The participants in the session in Delhi also expressed conviction that the economic and social consequences of the arms race hampered the establishment of a new economic order.

However, the U.S. Administration, which is going ahead with building up nuclear arsenals and preparing for 'star wars', perceived danger to the U.S. adventurist militarist course in the convocation of the conference. Washington got frightened with the very prospect that the spiraling up of the arms race by the United States and the attempt at frustrating a political dialogue and talks on disarmament by the USA would be strongly criticised at the forum. Then, Washington decided to sabotage the work of the Preparatory Committee. In April the United States officially stated its refusal to attend the conference. Such a stand cannot be interpreted otherwise than an overt unwillingness of Washington to consider and tackle the problem of disarmament in a constructive spirit and to contribute to overcoming the difficulties which are being experienced by the developing countries.

Under Washington's pressure, Western countries, too, began to show an obvious unwillingness to engage in coordinating a draft final document of the conference within the framework of the preparatory committee. Some of them even came forward with a proposal to postpone the convocation of the conference 'in view of the revealed differences.' But differences in approaches to the problem which was formulated at the 40th session of the U.N. General Assembly, cannot and should not become a ground or a cause for renouncing a search for mutually acceptable solutions. The conference, for which the international community declared unanimously, should be convened as scheduled in order to give an impulse to active steps to end the arms race, to reduce arms, to cut down military expenditures, and to use the fruits of work exclusively for creative purposes and for a solution to global problems which become aggravated.

It is believed in the Soviet Union that the militarism-imposed principle of arming instead of development should be replaced by an opposite order of things: disarmament for development. It is necessary to secure that every measure aimed at limiting and reducing arms, and every step along the lines of freeing the world from nuclear and other weapons should not only bring more security to the peoples but should also make it possible to allocate more funds to improve people's living conditions.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1414



## RELATED ISSUES

### USSR HOSTS SCIENTISTS CONFERENCE AGAINST NUCLEAR WAR

#### Fedoseyev Preview

PM281400 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 27 May 86 Second Edition p 3

[TASS correspondent L. Chernenko article: "Curbing the Forces of War"]

[Text] Moscow -- Scientists are particularly aware of the scale of the danger concealed in nuclear arsenals and acutely realize the irreversible destruction that would be caused by a nuclear conflict. That is why they devote the full force of scientific evidence, the cogency and accuracy of their arguments, the activeness of their life stance, and their passion as researchers to the defense of peace. This movement is becoming increasingly prestigious and effective. The second All-union Conference of Scientists on the Problems of Peace and the Prevention of Nuclear War, which opens in Moscow 27 May, is an important stage in the peace movement.

At the conference it is planned to discuss the fundamental questions of preventing a nuclear war, ensuring lasting peace, and developing international cooperation, Academician P.N. Fedoseyev, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, told this TASS correspondent. Delegations of scientists from the union republics and scientific centers of the RSFSR and more than 100 foreign guests will take part.

The current year -- the International Year of Peace -- has been marked by the Soviet Union's major peace-loving initiatives and actions. The comprehensive international security program put forward and substantiated in the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the 15 January statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and in his speeches on Soviet television envisages the complete elimination of nuclear weapons and other means of mass destruction before the year 2000.

The conference, which will be held within the framework of the International Year of Peace, will examine in detail all aspects of this program and define scientists' role in propagandizing and implementing it. The impermissibility of the militarization of space, peaceful international cooperation in this sphere, the possible consequences of a nuclear war, topical aspects of disarmament, and the global problems of civilization represent the range of questions the participants will discuss.

Naturally, the conference will devote great attention to international scientific cooperation and the peaceful application of the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution, particularly the utilization of nuclear power. Soviet scientists and their foreign colleagues were profoundly interested in the proposals expressed in M.S. Gorbachev's speech on Soviet television for closer cooperation among all states engaged in nuclear power generation. The Chernobyl disaster, like nuclear power station accidents in other countries, requires joint efforts particularly. Unfortunately, ruling circles in Western countries are obstructing the development of contacts between scientists in different states. But scientists worldwide are vitally interested in gearing scientific achievements to the good of their people and the good of mankind. We hope, P.N. Fedoseyev noted, that exchanges of opinions with our foreign colleagues will be useful and fruitful.

Under the conditions of the scientific and technical revolution, when science is becoming an increasingly direct productive force, the role of scientists is naturally growing and their influence on the course of public affairs increasing. It is researchers' specialist knowledge in various spheres of science and technology that increases their role not only in consultations but in resolving important problems. The potential of scientists influence in resolving the problems of war and peace depends, of course, on the policy of the ruling parties and the class nature of the states.

Whereas in the socialist countries scientists' ideas and aspirations coincide with party and state policy, in the Western countries scientists' peace-loving intentions and actions run counter to the ruling elites' policies, which are built on the concept of force and military domination. That is why in capitalist states scientists have to work under difficult conditions in order to defend peace. Yet nonetheless, scientists' opinions are getting through to people's hearts and minds. The weight of those opinions is growing. Soviet scientists highly value their foreign colleagues' noble role and support all these peace-loving initiatives. We can see that the movement of the scientific community against war is becoming increasingly mass-based in nature in the West.

At a time when scientific thought is opening up unusually powerful and at the same time threatening sources and types of energy scientists' responsibility for the results of the application of their discoveries, which should be used solely for people's benefit, is also growing. Scientists must also be clearly aware of how great their responsibility is in the event of science being abused for military purposes whose implementation would lead to innumerable disasters for all mankind and could threaten life on earth itself. The main concern of scientists and of all socialist society is the people's good and the development and galvanization of the human factor. Many different scientific institutions are studying these questions. A Scientific Council for Human Problems has been set up at the USSR Academy of Sciences to coordinate this research.

The weight of Soviet scientists' opinions and proposals on questions of the defense of peace and the peaceful utilization of scientific achievements rests on the high prestige of domestic science, which is the most advanced in the world in many highly important avenues. The first nuclear power station and the first steps in peaceful space exploration all show the peaceful aspirations of Soviet science. And the list of such achievements is growing.

## Fedoseyev Addresses Group

LD270640 Moscow TASS in English 0610 GMT 27 May 86

[Text] Moscow, 27 May (TASS)--Scientists regard it as their duty to facilitate the realization of the loftiest dream of the peoples--to preclude war forever from the life of society and assert a lasting and firm peace, Petr Fedoseyev, vice president of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, has declared.

He addressed the second conference of Soviet scientists on problems of peace and prevention of nuclear war, which opened in Moscow today.

159 scientists from 47 countries have arrived to attend the forum.

Noting that the conference was devoted to the U.N.-designated International Year of Peace, Academician Fedoseyev stressed that the threat looming large over mankind through the fault of the militaristic circles had never been so ominous as today.

But never before has there been so real opportunities to preserve and consolidate peace. 1986 was marked by the USSR's drastic initiatives and actions in shaping a new international climate and handling the global task of eliminating weapons of mass annihilation.

The USSR favoured the establishment of a comprehensive system of international security and development of international cooperation in peaceful uses of achievements of scientific and technical revolution, especially in the safe utilization of atomic energy, Fedoseyev pointed out.

## Academy President on Issues

LD270644 Moscow TASS in English 0634 GMT 27 May 86

[Text] Moscow May 27 TASS -- "A nuclear war is a threat to world civilization. Only real disarmament and universal security can be the reliable foundation of preserving peace," Anatoliy Aleksandrov, president of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, has declared.

He today addressed the second all-union conference of scientists on problems of peace and prevention of nuclear war.

The recent misfortune in Chernobyl, the academician stressed, and the previous accidents at atomic power plants in several countries graphically showed the inter-relationship and inter-dependence of today's world and the universal objective interest in ensuring effective control over the formidable force of the atom.

"This is an absolute imperative of preventing nuclear war with all its disastrous consequences."

Academician Aleksandrov emphasised that technical systems, which were getting ever more sophisticated, could not ensure military superiority and victory in nuclear war. But they were shaking strategic stability and increasing the risk of error, malfunction and miscalculation threatening to grow into uncontrollable and irreversible consequences.

"Mankind cannot remain a hostage of accident. The threat looming over the world should be averted, radically averted. Achieving this objective is impossible by spiralling the arms race and transferring it into outer space," Aleksandrov pointed out.

## Velikhov on Limited War, SDI

LD272039 Moscow TASS in English 1715 GMT 27 May 86

[Text] Moscow May 27 TASS -- The nature of modern weapons is such that even the most powerful and refined defences cannot ensure the security of any country, stated Yevgeniy Velikhov, vice-president of the USSR Academy of Sciences. He spoke in Moscow today at the Soviet scientists' current all-union conference which is dealing with the problems of peace and the prevention of nuclear war.

Academician Velikhov pointed out the coincidence of the views of scientists of various countries on key problems of our times. He said, in particular, that U.S. colleagues from the Federation of American Scientists are also of the opinion that nuclear war would be the greatest disaster to mankind and that there exists no effective defence against a nuclear attack.

The "limited" war concept, he went on to say, does not hold water, since a nuclear disaster, happening, for example, in the Northern Hemisphere, would inevitably move under the influence of atmospheric processes to the other side. Therefore a nuclear war would have no living witnesses, and it would affect all countries.

A particular danger, Academician Velikhov said, would be posed by a transfer of the arms race to outer space. Soviet and American scientists independently arrived at the same opinion: The U.S. plans for the development of an impenetrable anti-missile defence system with space-based elements are an illusion. The idea is not backed up by any modern scientific or technical notions. "It is quite evident to us that the development of an anti-missile defence system is oriented towards ensuring the impunity of a first strike on the part of the United States. The SDI programme", Velikhov explained, "is part and parcel of Washington's overall military plan based on an offensive nuclear strategy".

## Dobrynin Conference Report

PM291100 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 May 86 First Edition p 4

[Unattributed report: "Into the 21st Century Without Nuclear Weapons; All-Union Conference of Scientists" -- capitalized passages printed in boldface]

[Text] The planet's inhabitants are now facing the question of war and peace in all its urgency because the might of the weapons stockpiled on earth has never before been so destructive and so threatening for mankind. Scientists are now particularly aware of the danger contained in the arsenals of nuclear weapons. A sincere desire to examine objectively the complex and dangerous situation in which mankind finds itself and a firm intention to strengthen the scientific flank of the antiwar movement unites the participants of the Conference of Scientists on the Problems of Peace and the Prevention of Nuclear War, which opened in Moscow 27 May.

The conference presidium consists of leaders of the USSR Academy of Sciences, eminent scientists from abroad, and representatives of international scientific organizations.

The conference was opened by Academician P.N. Fedoseyev, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences. This year, he said, which is the International Year of Peace, has been marked by major peace-loving initiatives and actions by the Soviet Union. The all-embracing program for international security put forward by the 27th CPSU Congress and later developed in statements by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee envisages the complete elimination of nuclear weapons and other means of mass destruction by the year 2000.

Academician A.P. Aleksandrov, president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, delivered an introductory speech to the participants in the scientists' antiwar forum. A reliable foundation for the preservation of peace, he said, can be provided only by real disarmament and universal security.

Technical systems, which constantly increase in complexity, cannot ensure military superiority and victory in a nuclear war, but they do shake strategic stability and increase the probability of mistakes, malfunctions, and errors fraught with uncontrollable and irreversible consequences. Mankind cannot remain a hostage to chance, and therefore the danger hanging over the world must be eliminated, and eliminated radically.

A report entitled "For a Nuclear-Free World by the 21st Century" was delivered by A.F. Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. He conveyed to the participants in the conference a greeting from M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and his wishes for fruitful work and success in all the activity of scientists aimed at creating a nuclear-free world, a world rid of the threat of nuclear war and freed from nuclear weapons.

Recently, the speaker said, M.S. Gorbachev has repeatedly addressed the question of the role and position of science and scientists in the cause of preserving peace and life itself on earth. The leadership of our party and our country highly values the contribution made by scientists not only to exploring nature's secrets, but also to joint efforts designed to protect mankind from the unwise use of the achievements of science, and particularly to the cause of preventing war.

Soviet people are profoundly gratified by the fact that our country was the initiator of a radical program to deliver the world from nuclear arms by the end of this century. The 15 January statement by M.S. Gorbachev, the foreign policy initiatives formulated in the Central Committee Political Report to the 27th party congress, and the USSR's proposals put forward after the congress -- all this, we believe, inspires people's hearts with new hope.

Our comprehensive plan offers an opportunity for the total elimination of nuclear weapons everywhere in the world under strict international verification [kontrol]. Likewise for the elimination of chemical weapons, their stockpiles, and the industrial base for their production, as well as for a ban on the creation [sozdaniye] of non-nuclear weapons based on new physical principles and closely resembling other types of mass destruction weapons in terms of their casualty-producing capability. Now these proposals have been supplemented by the proposal to reduce conventional arms and armed forces throughout the European zone, from the Atlantic to the Urals.

The historic importance of the new Soviet proposals is obvious. These proposals are realistic because they do not pursue the objective of gaining any unilateral advantages for the Soviet Union, and they accord with the fundamental interests not only of our own country and our allies and friends, but also of the United States, the NATO countries, and people all over the world.

It is our profound belief that the nuclear arms race does not ensure international stability but, on the contrary, helps to constantly intensify the threat of nuclear conflict. This becomes particularly obvious if you consider the qualitative aspect of the arms race.

Rapid changes in military technology lead objectively to the emergence of weapons and systems that can render the verification [kontrol] of arms limitation and reduction unbelievably difficult, and even impossible. Furthermore, they create a completely different situation by inexorably reducing decisionmaking time, leaving more and more decisions to machines and equipment, and thus, step by step, depriving political leaders even of the right to deliberate, discuss, and ponder.

The "Strategic Defense Initiative" program being implemented by the Reagan administration, which is a graphic example of a senseless "flight into technology" in the hope of reviving the former American advantage, presents a great danger to peace and the stability of military-strategic equilibrium.

Today I would like to recall that a large group of Soviet scientists was among the first to provide a weighty analytical evaluation of the U.S. "star wars" program. The Soviet scientists' "Appeal to All Scientists in the World," published in April 1983, said: "In reality, the attempt to create [sozdaniye] so-called 'defensive weapons' against the other side's strategic nuclear forces, as announced by the U.S. President, will inevitably lead to the emergence of yet another element strengthening the U.S. 'first strike' potential." Today, as we know, this opinion is shared by many thousands of scientists from all countries, including a large number of scientists and experts in the United States, the FRG, Britain, Australia, and Canada.

The Soviet response to the creation [sozdaniye] of a large-scale ABM system with space-based elements by the United States will be, as M.S. Gorbachev noted, citing our scientists' studies [razrabotki], efficient, cheaper, and capable of being implemented within a shorter time; moreover, this response will not necessarily take place in outer space. Nevertheless, we are consistently opposed to an arms race in space, A.F. Dobrynin said, primarily because we are perfectly aware of the dangerous consequences it may produce.

The champions of SDI use an argument aimed specifically at the scientific community to the effect that this program will supposedly ensure a new breakthrough in the sphere of technology and will stimulate the development of scientific thinking. But can progress in science and technology be achieved only by subordinating them to military goals? On the contrary, peaceful goals offer the broadest scope for scientific quest and the application of its results, and for man's benefit too. This is why the Soviet stance does not boil down to just an exposure of the "star wars" plans and a demonstration of the deadly nature of these plans. It also includes an important alternative constructive element -- peaceful cooperation in the exploration of outer space. This was precisely what M.S. Gorbachev spoke about at the meeting with the delegation from the Nobel Prize Winners Congress, emphasizing that we are in favor of a fundamentally new way to accelerate progress in science and technology.

The limitation and reduction of nuclear arms, the prevention of an arms race in space, and the transition to real disarmament measures would provide the main real and reliable instrument for strengthening strategic stability and reducing the military danger. It is necessary to agree honestly and in a businesslike fashion on specific measures to reduce, and later eliminate the threat of a nuclear war. To agree before it is too late.

Dwelling on the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva, A.F. Dobrynin emphasized that the Soviet Union has done and will continue to do everything in its power to ensure that the "Geneva spirit" is embodied in specific accords. On the other hand, Reagan's administration has yet to make a single gesture of goodwill in response, even a symbolic gesture.

Fortunately, by no means are all questions of world politics resolved in Washington. We are witnessing the emergence and affirmation of a new thinking, a new approach toward the problems of peace. They accord with the interests of every people and of the entire international community.

The interdependence of survival -- the unbreakable unity of the historical fate of all states in the world in the face of a possible nuclear conflict -- is of fundamental importance. This interdependence determines the need for a qualitatively new approach toward the problem of national security, an approach that is also one of the distinguishing features of the new political thinking.

Security in the world today is said to be based on fear of unavoidable retribution. We did not canonize this ultimately unreliable method of ensuring security. The USSR has never considered this position to be normal or acceptable. We have invariably advocated a reduction of the level of military confrontation with observance of the principle of equal security.

This is because the nature of today's weapons leaves no state the hope of defending itself solely by military-technological means, by creating even the most powerful defenses, for example. Thus the ideas of national and international security have become inseparable. "Speaking of relations between the USSR and the United States," the CPSU Central Committee Political Report emphasized, "security can only be mutual, and, speaking of international relations as a whole, it can only be universal. Supreme wisdom does not lie in being concerned solely about oneself, especially to the detriment of the other side. It is necessary for everyone to feel equally secure, because the fears and alarms of the nuclear age generate unpredictability in politics and in specific actions." The new political thinking presupposes a new and qualitatively higher level of flexibility in foreign policy, a readiness to make sensible compromises with one's partners in talks. Unfortunately, such readiness is very often lacking among many political leaders in the West, primarily in the United States. Of course, a certain boldness is needed to depart from accepted views and concepts. But this boldness is already becoming a political reality, insofar as there are forces in the world that are either basing their foreign policy activity on the new thinking or are actively striving for it.

An obvious manifestation of this new thinking is provided by the unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions, which was recently extended once again by the Soviet leadership until 6 August. We again call on the U.S. state leaders to reach agreement on a nuclear test ban.

Of course, the process of shaping and affirming the new political thinking is a very difficult matter. Fierce clashes, sharp discussions, and painful differences are inevitable here. And yet, face to face with the threat of a nuclear apocalypse, mankind is beginning to perceive the simple truth: In order to survive, we must proceed in international relations not from narrowly perceived interests that place us in opposition to one another, but from our common interests and aspirations.

Scientists can and must do much to ensure that revolutionary transformations in thinking and in the approach toward questions of war and peace become reality. This offers a vast and very important field of activity for the representatives of all sciences. The representatives of Soviet science have already played a considerable role in revealing and analyzing major problems of international relations, international security, war and peace, and disarmament. Active cooperation has proved extremely fruitful in the serious research and explanatory work done by our leading scientists studying world politics, economics, and natural sciences. This fact has been displayed particularly vividly in the activity of the Committee of Soviet Scientists in Defense of Peace, Against the Nuclear Threat. A great international response has been evoked by the results of the joint activity of Soviet scientists and their colleagues abroad within the framework of the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War Organization and the Pugwash Movement of scientists.

At the same time, we have a great need for new and even deeper studies on international and military-political issues, covering an increasingly broad range of problems. Essentially, life demands that this entire sphere of science be elevated to a qualitatively new level determined by the new political thinking. Above all it is a question of the major tasks confronting Soviet science and the scientific community in light of the concept, put forward by the 27th CPSU Congress, of creating an all-embracing system of international security, a system embracing all parts of the world and all spheres -- the military, political, economic, and humanitarian spheres whose totality represents, so to speak, all the stories of the edifice of international relations.

Hence the particular importance of an in-depth scientific analysis of political processes and their interconnected socioeconomic factors both on a broad international scale and on a local scale, in other words on the scale of scrupulous study of the specific national and regional forms of the development of these political processes.

Moreover now, under the conditions of the growing dynamism in all of international life, special and sometimes vital significance attaches to the skilled and, I emphasize, prompt evaluation of new and still emerging trends and their inherent dangers of potential.

Regarding MILITARY-POLITICAL sphere, it is obvious that here our attention must focus on resolving the totality of problems stemming from the task of blocking all channels via which armed conflicts develop.

First, there is the problem of norms of behavior by states, including their military activity. Second, the problem of reducing the military potential and of limiting and destroying the means of waging war, the problem of dismantling the material apparatus of war. Third, the problem of settling local conflicts, which are fraught with the danger of developing into a world war.

Our concept of an all-embracing system of international security organically includes also the ECONOMIC SPHERE. Research into the multifaceted problems connected with this issue is extremely valuable. What is important is the answer to the question: How do we see ways of settling the foreign debts of developing countries? Here is another and very important long-term problem: What are the priority needs toward which the funds released as a result of disarmament must be channeled? The duty of Soviet scientists is to work out in depth an integrated and comprehensive model of international economic security. Many problems are now appearing on a global level. These are the problems of the destruction of man's habitat, the quest for new sources of energy, the struggle against economic backwardness and famine, and the exploration of space and the world's oceans.



These are all global problems, and such problems demand, of course, global solutions. The most efficient solution, and quite possibly any solution at all of global economic problems can be achieved only by adding together national conditions on an international scale, via collective action by all members of the world community of nations. Such cooperation, of course, presupposes the elimination of all elements of discrimination and diktat in economic relations, normalization of the international situation, and reduction of the level of military confrontation. In other words, here too we come directly face to face with questions of war and peace, the main questions of our nuclear age.

And now, about the HUMANITARIAN SPHERE. Our concept of security is aimed at accomplishing the most humane of all the tasks facing mankind today: To prevent war and to guarantee the paramount natural human right -- to live under conditions of peace and freedom. There is, however, also a reverse connection here. It lies in the fact that the organization of truly civilized and proper norms of international contact and cooperation depends directly and immediately on the solution of many problems in the humanitarian sphere.

We attach the most serious importance to the problem of human rights, the speaker said, as a substantial factor of peace and international cooperation in this sphere. The only thing that is necessary is to free it from hypocrisy and speculation. No matter how paradoxical it may sound, those who occupy extremist positions in the arms race appear as the main champions of human rights. Anti-Soviet slander campaigns based on dense ignorance of human rights issues in our country are one of the favorite means used by world reaction to whip up international tension. But what does freeing this problem from speculation mean? It means not only rebuffing the speculators but also properly working out this problem in a constructive fashion. Different social systems have different criteria of human values, but the task is to find effective and realistic forms of international cooperation in this sphere and define the framework and criteria of such cooperation so as to rule out interference in internal affairs and ensure observance of the generally recognized principles of interstate relations.

The new thinking certainly does not mean abandonment of the classic analysis of problems of war and peace. It does, however, presuppose combining our ideals, in Marx' words, of real humanism with the democratic and peace-loving aspirations of all social strata acting in defense of the interests of all humanity, for the salvation of civilization.

We attach enormous significance, the speaker concluded to cooperation among scientists from different countries -- which has been growing stronger over the last few years -- in the struggle against the nuclear threat. We believe that, by augmenting their efforts, the scientists will remain in the vanguard of the fighters for mankind's survival, for its happiness, and for its future.

#### Forum Appeals to World Scientists

LD291646 Moscow TASS in English 1233 GMT 29 May 86

[Text] Moscow May 29 TASS -- The participants at the Second National Conference of Scientists on the Problems of Peace and the Prevention of Nuclear War have addressed an urgent appeal to their colleagues throughout the world to use their authority and knowledge for stepping up efforts against the nuclear menace. The conference in Moscow, which is now in its third day, is being attended also by guests from 47 countries.

"Ruling circles in the West," the appeal said, "continue to pursue the tough course of confrontation and step up the arms race. This policy inevitably increases the probability of a nuclear catastrophe." "The alarming situation that has emerged in international relations calls for stepping up the world-wide struggle for peace," it said. "As persons studying the laws of development of nature and society, we scientists realize that the monstrous destructive force of modern weapons makes any defense, even with the help of the most powerful defense systems, impossible, that it is impossible to win not only a nuclear war, but also the arms race."

To ensure international security is a task facing all humanity, and it can be solved only by the joint efforts of all -- through the consistent curtailment of confrontation, limitation and reduction of armaments, settling regional conflicts, and ensuring reliable security for all. Complete cessation of nuclear weapons tests would be an important step towards nuclear disarmament, the appeal said. The scientists expressed the conviction that in conditions of a tense nuclear confrontation a new mentality is required in international relations. They said that an example of a new approach to the vital problems of our time has been demonstrated by the Soviet Union which has put forward a historic program for the complete elimination of weapons of mass annihilation by the end of this century. "Genuine disarmament and a stable peace would open broad vistas for uniting the efforts of states and peoples in the name of construction. A comprehensive development of international cooperation in every sphere of constructive activity -- from the exploration of outer space to research into the depths of the world ocean, from the protection of the environment to the peaceful utilization of atomic energy, from the elimination of hunger to the eradication of diseases -- is both possible and necessary," the appeal said.

#### Conference Ends

LD291632 Moscow TASS in English 1220 GMT 29 May 86

[Text] Moscow May 29 TASS -- The Second National Conference of Scientists on the Problems of Peace and the Prevention of Nuclear War ended in Moscow today after issuing an appeal to the world's scientists to step up their efforts against the growing threat of a nuclear conflagration. The three-day meeting was attended by scientists from also 47 other countries. Together with Soviet colleagues they discussed ways of preventing outer space militarization, promoting international cooperation in outer space and achieving nuclear disarmament, limiting conventional arms, as well as the possible consequences of a nuclear war.

Delivering a report at the conference, Anatoliy Dobrynin, a secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, stressed that the USSR attaches much importance to the international cooperation of scientists to remove the nuclear threat. A report on the activities and plans of the Soviet scientists' committee for peace and against the nuclear threat was made by its chairman, Academician Yegheniy Velikhov.

Academician Petr Fedoseyev, a vice-president of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, said in the closing speech that the conference has demonstrated the increased political awareness of scientists. He noted that the attending physicians, chemists, mathematicians, and social scientists of different countries have spoken out for productive interaction in studying the pressing problems of war and peace.

Fedoseyev said the Soviet scientists appreciate the fact that the foreign guests have come out in support of the constructive peace initiatives of the USSR.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1414

## RELATED ISSUES

### JAPANESE FOREIGN MINISTER DISCUSSES SECURITY ISSUES IN MOSCOW

Gorbachev on INF, SDI

LD301850 Moscow TASS in English 1845 GMT 30 May 86

[Excerpts] Moscow, 30 May (TASS)--Mikhail Gorbachev today received in the Kremlin Japan's Minister of Foreign Affairs Shintaro Abe who presented a message from Japan's Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone.

A wide range of problems of the international situation and bilateral relations were discussed. Shintaro Abe pointed to "a great role of the Soviet leadership in ensuring peace and international stability." Mikhail Gorbachev, pointing to Japan's vast potentials in resolving present-day world problems, set out the foundations of the Soviet Union's home and foreign policy which is oriented at giving an adequate answer to the demands of the nuclear age, of the scientific and technological revolution, to questions that stem from a complex nature, versatility, contradictoriness and inter-relationship of the world of today and which no one can evade any longer. Civilised attitudes, new political thinking, respect for legitimate interests of various states are needed for their solution.

When discussing the question of medium-range nuclear missiles on which Shintaro Abe spoke in the spirit of the "global approach" characteristic of the United States and NATO perplexity was expressed that it is insistently suggested that the Soviet Union eliminate medium-range nuclear missiles in the eastern part of the country, while the destruction of corresponding nuclear weapons targetted on the USSR from the territory of Japan and its littoral waters is not required of the Americans. Mikhail Gorbachev, nevertheless, suggested to the interlocutor looking jointly for the solution of this problem, too.

In answer to Shintaro Abe's request Mikhail Gorbachev set out the known Soviet stand about a new meeting with the President of the United States. It was said in this connection that the Soviet leadership is prepared to consider compromise solutions, but never will it make unilateral concessions: "We shall not yield either to political, or economic, or military pressure. Any agreement can be a result of constructive talks only".

The meeting can be productive if the approach to it, to the creation of the necessary atmosphere for its holding are rid of illusions about the motives for the Soviet interest in the meeting.

serious concern was expressed over the intentions of the Japanese leadership to switch Japan's potential to the U.S. "star wars" plans, which cannot but affect the assessment of Japan's foreign policy intentions and Soviet-Japanese relations.

Points of contact and aspects of differences and disagreement were established as a result of a candid and benevolent conversation.

Mikhail Gorbachev asked Shintaro Abe to convey to the Japanese leadership, the Japanese people the fact that Soviet people are sincerely interested in good relations with it and wish the Japanese to view the Land of Soviets as a true neighbour, who has no perfidious designs and is prepared, honestly and by joint efforts, to seek the ways for a greater mutual understanding and interaction for the benefit of peace and in mutual interests.

#### Shevardnadze, Abe Speeches

PM041529 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jun 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Minister's Visit"]

[Excerpts] Talks began in Moscow on 30 May between E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, and S. Abe, Japanese foreign minister. The guest is paying an official visit to our country at the Soviet Government's invitation.

On the same day E.A. Shevardnadze gave a luncheon in S. Abe's honor. Among those present were P.N. Demichev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, A.F. Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, A.K. Antonov and G.I. Marchuk, deputy chairmen of the USSR Council of Ministers, ministers, chairmen of USSR State Committees, and other officials.

Y. Katori, Japanese ambassador to the USSR, and officials accompanying S. Abe were present at the luncheon for the Japanese side.

Speeches were exchanged. E.A. Shevardnadze said in his speech: At our recent meeting in Tokyo we noted with satisfaction the resumption of Soviet-Japanese political dialogue and agreed to continue it. Now, when you are in Moscow, Mr Minister, we are justified in saying that our dialogue is acquiring a stable character. That is in the interests of our countries and peoples and of world peace.

Now that we have met for the second time, it is extremely important that we determine in principle the further direction and content of our dialogue. In our view it must definitely be directed toward developing Soviet-Japanese relations in all spheres. But it is also obvious that our relations exist within the framework of certain realities and that those realities oblige us to view world politics in the broadest terms. The path from being just neighbors to becoming good neighbors is also part of the improvement of the international situation, the lowering of tension there, and the strengthening of the foundations of peace and world security. It is our firm conviction that present-day Japan could use its considerable weight and prestige to ensure that the realities of our time do not force us in different directions but instead promote the development of mutual understanding, confidence, and cooperation. Then some acute problems in our relations would appear differently.

I believe that our intensive search for ways to ensure a nuclear-free future for mankind should produce a powerful response among the Japanese in particular who have experienced for themselves the horror of the nuclear hell. And it is for that very reason that we hope for cooperation with Japan in implementing the program for the destruction of nuclear and chemical weapons set out in the 15 January 1986 statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

Our peoples have a vitally important interest in the ending of nuclear explosions. The Soviet Union's position on this matter is well known. We not only consistently pursue the line of achieving an international accord on the general and complete banning of nuclear weapons tests but have also unilaterally imposed a moratorium on all nuclear explosions. Recently M.S. Gorbachev announced that this moratorium will operate until 6 August this year and offered President Reagan a special meeting.

By continuing its nuclear explosions the United States is also destroying the hopes of the peoples, including the Japanese people.

We are aware of the attempts that have been made to convince other countries that the level of their security will rise if the U.S. "star wars" program is implemented. Some take this on trust and even hurry to take part in it. It is for the Japanese side to make the appropriate decision, of course. I should like to draw attention, however, to the offensive character of space armaments, which are being developed as a more dangerous equivalent of nuclear weapons. The appearance of these armaments will reduce the level of all states' security and will make the continuation of the process of limiting and curtailing the arms race virtually impossible.

Judging by the U.S. Administration's recent statements, it is already trying to discard as quickly as possible all restrictions standing in the way of a nuclear and other arms buildup. We can see this from the example of Washington's attitude toward the SALT II treaty. And we are not dealing with imaginary violations of its provisions by the other side -- it is simply that the latest U.S. nuclear missiles hit and exceed the treaty's limits. The limits established by the treaty have become a hindrance. So they are trying to sweep it away. That is the "logic" of the militarist policy and the evolution of the politicians who refused to ratify this most important agreement in the strategic arms limitation sphere.

Such actions cause grave alarm throughout the world.

The point of all this is not to cause discord in Japan's relations with its allies. We simply proceed from the premise that any discussion with a neighbor presupposes complete frankness. Neighbours must be truthful with one another.

Yes, the neighborliness factor imposes many obligations. In particular, the obligation that we actively help to reduce tension in the Asian and Pacific regions, consolidate the security of all states in Asia, and establish broad, equitable, and mutually beneficial cooperation among them.

The recent Soviet Government statement on questions of the situation in the region made some specific observations. We propose that an exchange of opinions begin as soon as possible among all interested countries of this part of the world. The most important thing is that these should be joint steps by the Asian and Pacific states to consolidate the foundations of peace in the region and strengthen security. We see them taking the

form of the broadest democratic discussion of all the questions of interest to the Pacific countries. Such a discussion may be organized in different forms -- collectively or on a bilateral basis. We are ready to exchange opinions with those who support our idea and with those who offer alternative solutions.

The Soviet Union and Japan could set an example and, of course, do quite a lot on a practical level. Other states would also gain from our cooperation.

In his reply speech, S. Abe expressed high appreciation of the regular consultations between the USSR and Japanese foreign ministers and expressed the hope that the present meeting would also be successful. He said that there are unresolved questions in Japanese-Soviet relations.

I would also like to note the significance of political dialogue between us not only for Japanese-Soviet relations but also for the international situation as a whole. In the present complex international situation the active conduct of high-level political dialogue between states with different social systems is vital to eliminate mutual distrust and solve existing problems. In the past 4 months Japan and the Soviet Union have had two opportunities to hold direct political dialogue and to conduct a frank and useful exchange of opinions on the most important questions of the present-day international situation. Our present talks are attracting considerable interest throughout the world. I also want to stress the importance of political dialogue between the Soviet Union and other states. I believe it highly desirable that dialogue, not confrontation, be the basis of international policy. In this regard I should like to note the fact that all the peoples of the world pin great hopes on political dialogue between the Soviet Union and the United States, which bear a great responsibility for the solution of such very important international problems as disarmament and arms limitation. In particular, the world's peoples would like a second U.S.-Soviet summit to be held as soon as possible.

The luncheon took place in a friendly atmosphere.

#### PRAVDA Carries Joint Communiqué

PM011614 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jun 86 First Edition p 4

["Soviet-Japanese Joint Communiqué"--PRAVDA headline]

[Excerpts] Japanese Foreign Minister Shintaro Abe was in the Soviet Union on an official visit 29 through 31 May 1986 at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

S. Abe was received by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. During a conversation held in a spirit of frankness there was a discussion of key problems of the international situation and also fundamental questions of the state and development prospects of Soviet-Japanese relations.

As part of a routine consultative meeting between E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and the USSR foreign minister, and Japanese Foreign Minister S. Abe, talks were held during which there was a discussion of questions of bilateral relations and also international problems of mutual interest.

Having noted the two sides' efforts to improve Soviet-Japanese relations, the ministers confirmed the interest in their further ongoing development on the basis of the principles of mutual benefit, equality, and noninterference in internal affairs. They stressed that such development is in keeping with the interests of both countries and would constitute a great contribution to the cause of strengthening peace and stability in Asia and throughout the world.

The ministers conducted a frank exchange of opinions on topical problems of the present-day international situation of mutual interest, including the safeguarding of peace and disarmament, and also certain regional problems.

They stressed the need for efforts to maintain and strengthen peace and expressed themselves in favor of the speediest reaching of accords on arms limitation and disarmament in the field of nuclear and conventional arms, envisaging a maximum lowering of the level of military confrontation.

The two sides advocated the need to continue efforts to ease tension in the Asia-Pacific Ocean region. In this connection they supported the steps to organize contacts and talks in the region and agreed on the need to create a situation promoting their further galvanization. They stressed that constructive assistance to the efforts of the countries located here on the basis of respect for their independence would serve the cause of peace and stability in this region of the world.

The ministers came to a unanimous opinion on the need to continue to promote the consolidation of positive trends in the development of the situation in the world by expanding bilateral dialogue on international problems.

The ministers confirmed their common understanding that nuclear power serves as an important source of energy for present and future generations of mankind and, taking into account the fact that ensuring its safety is a most important task, came to a unanimous opinion on the need for efforts at the international level, including seeking ways to increase the role and potential of the IAEA. The ministers also expressed themselves in support of the proposal to convene an authoritative international conference under IAEA auspices to discuss this entire set of questions and noted the advisability of including the United Nations and such international organizations as the World Health Organization and the United Nations Environment Program in such a conference.

The sides noted the businesslike and meaningful nature of the meetings and talks held during Japanese Foreign Minister S. Abe's visit, confirming their usefulness for both sides.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1414

## RELATED ISSUES

### SOVIET ARMY PAPER ADDRESSES ASIAN SECURITY ISSUES

PM081807 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 5 Jun 86 Second Edition p 3

[A. Dmitriyev article: "For Security in Asia. The Policy of Peace Against the Policy of War"]

[Text] Mankind is living through an alarming and crucial stage of its development. Energetic actions aimed at improving the international situation are demanded today more than ever before. All this also applies directly to the Asian and Pacific region. Important processes are occurring there and they cannot but affect the USSR's stance as one of the greatest Asian powers, its friends and allies, and the interests of international peace and security.

The peoples of the region advocate the strengthening of good-neighborliness and friendship between Asian and Pacific countries and the pooling of their efforts in a joint quest for constructive solutions to security problems in Asia and the Pacific. There is, however, another noticeable trend, a negative one. Certain political circles in the United States and Japan do not perceive this region otherwise than as the arena of confrontation between different countries. The United States does not limit itself to just building up its military forces in the Pacific year by year. With Tokyo's help, it has embarked on knocking together a closed regional group, the so-called "Pacific Community," intending to transform it into yet another militarist bloc in the longer term.

As far as the USSR is concerned, it has suggested a broad program to improve the situation in Asia. It was formulated in the 23 April statement by the Soviet Government. "The Soviet Union," the statement emphasizes, "proposes... by means of bilateral and multilateral consultations to achieve the solution of disputed questions, better understanding, and strengthening of trust, and thus to create prerequisites for holding an all-Asian forum for the joint quest for constructive solutions."

The statement notes that a number of states have already put forward proposals aimed at consolidating security in the region. These proposals deserve the most serious examination.

An active struggle for all-Asian security is waged by the socialist countries and some nonaligned states.



The proposal to elaborate and conclude a convention on mutual nonaggression and nonuse of force in relations between Asian and Pacific states, put forward by Mongolia back in 1981, offered serious opportunities for the strengthening of peace. Mongolia's initiative is an organic part of the comprehensive approach to ensuring peace and security in Asia.

Mongolia proposes that a conference of Asian and Pacific states be convened for the purpose of elaborating the convention's stipulations. In addition to the countries from the region, it could be attended also by all states that are permanent members of the UN Security Council, which would boost the international guarantees for its effectiveness.

The convention proposed by People's Mongolia envisages reciprocal respect for the independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity of all its signatories, inviolability of borders, noninterference in each other's internal affairs, nonuse of force or the threat of force, settlement of disputed problems exclusively by peaceful means, and development of mutually advantageous cooperation. Mongolia believes that the experience of the Bandung Conference and the well-known principles of peaceful coexistence proclaimed there must be taken into account during the elaboration of the convention. The convention could develop and consolidate the stipulations of the UN Charter and UN resolutions on questions concerning the renunciation of the use of force as applied to the specific situation in the region. An important place in the convention must be occupied by articles providing for energetic actions by signatory Asian and Pacific states to reduce military confrontation and curb the arms race, and for disarmament. J. Batmonh, general secretary of the MPRP Central Committee, emphasized in his report to the 19th MPRP Congress: "We will continue to make active efforts to implement this proposal in close conjunction with the constructive initiatives by other states in the region."

An improvement of the situation in the Far East would also further the implementation of comprehensive proposals put forward by the DPRK. They envisage, in particular, the withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Korea, the replacement of the armistice agreement by a peace treaty, the elaboration of a declaration on nonaggression between North and South, and the transformation of the Korean peninsula into a nuclear-free zone, a zone of peace. The implementation of these initiatives opens the way to the country's unification on peaceful and democratic principles without outside interference.

The steps being taken by the SRV, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, and the PRK [People's Republic of Kampuchea] are directed toward fundamental improvement of the situation in Southeast Asia. These countries consistently follow a course of establishing good-neighborly relations with the ASEAN countries on the basis of fruitful dialogue, a course of creating a zone of peace, stability, and cooperation in the region.

The implementation of the DRA's proposals for political settlement of the situation around that country would be a highly important step in the cause of ensuring peace and security in Asia. The DRA's foreign policy is aimed at the strengthening of universal peace and the development of comprehensive international cooperation.

It is built on the principles of active and positive nonalignment and utmost strengthening of good-neighborly and mutually advantageous relations with friendly countries.

Guided by these principles, the DRA Government assigns an important position to the normalization of relations with neighboring countries. Talks are being conducted between the DRA and Pakistan through the personal representative of the UN secretary general. Total cessation of intervention and creation of guarantees for the nonresumption of any outside interference in the Republic's internal affairs -- this is the essence of the DRA's initiatives at these talks.

The PRC could make its contribution to the strengthening of Asian security. It is an important positive fact that the PRC, just like the USSR, has pledged not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. Despite differences in the USSR's and the PRC's approaches toward some international problems, the interests of both states objectively coincide when the issue concerns the struggle for peace and socialism, against the threat of nuclear war, against the arms race, and in particular against its transfer into space.

To transform the Asian and Pacific region into a zone of lasting peace and good-neighborliness -- this is the imperative of the time.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1414

## RELATED ISSUES

### GORBACHEV WRITES PREFACE TO SPEECH ANTHOLOGY PUBLISHED IN UK

LD061948 Moscow World Service in English 1610 GMT 6 Jun 86

[Excerpt] The book "Selected Speeches and Articles" by General Secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Mikhail Gorbachev was brought out in English by the Pergamon Press publishers in Great Britain. The book contains a preface addressed to British readers by Mikhail Gorbachev, which reads as follows:

Naturally we have no intention to restrict ourselves to self-isolation. The Soviet Union is a member of the world community of nations, fully aware of the responsibility this fact involves. We proceed from the principle that an interdependent world, torn by contradictions yet integral in many ways, is taking shape through a dialectical conflict of opposites, feeling its way as it were. The formation of this interdependent and integral world is the essence of present-day social development and requires a new approach to international relations, a new philosophy of world politics. In other words, it is a question of working out a concept of international security to be adopted by all to enable us to retreat from the brink of nuclear war.

The realities of the nuclear age prove conclusively that military technology alone, even the most sophisticated kind, cannot guarantee national security. The advancement of weaponry is reducing to nil the significance of the vast oceans and enormous land distances, let alone mere straits.

Modern weapons have turned military power into a veritable boomerang, a nuclear one moreover, that is as sure to hit the thrower as his adversary. Therefore, concern for national security now demands the most scrupulous consideration of the security interests of other states. Mutual and equal security of all is imperative. This is our final conclusion.

The world is in a state of rapid change. Any social status quo is simply impossible. The existence of antagonism in our complex and many-faceted world makes it incumbent on states to realize their common interest and most important of all to learn the science and art of peaceful coexistence; to exercise restraint and circumspection on the international scene; to behave in a civilized manner; that is, to observe the rules of correct international intercourse and cooperation.

In short, it is imperative to renounce resolutely and for good the ways of thinking and acting that have taken shape over the centuries on the principle that war, armed conflicts, and a contest in armaments are permissible in the conduct of national policy. It is impossible to win such a contest, let alone a nuclear war. Contradictions should be settled on the lines of peaceful competition alone.

Such is our concept of national security in broad outlines. It's a basis for the program of establishing a comprehensive system of international security advanced by the 27th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party.

I realize that the ideas we put forward at our party congress may give rise to counter-proposals. We should welcome peace initiations by other states. I want to note at the same time that our proposals mean more than the offer of a dialogue. There is a dialogue in progress although it's rather half-hearted at times.

We invite other countries, including Great Britain of course, to take part in a collective effort to avert the danger of nuclear or any other war. It is common duty of all states regardless of their social systems to deal effectively with the global problems facing mankind. Great Britain has long been a great power. Mankind owes to British genius many of its cultural achievements, great scientific discoveries, and brilliant inventions. I'm not just paying compliments. The history of Great Britain, like that of many other countries, doesn't consist merely of bright pages. However, our common concern for the future of mankind has come to the forefront.

I am confident that fruitful Soviet-British cooperation could greatly contribute to normalizing international relations and changing over from confrontation and suspicion to good-neighborliness and mutual trust. The Soviet Union is prepared for such a new deal. I avail myself of this opportunity to reaffirm the Soviet people's willingness to develop friendly ties with the people of Great Britain, and I wish them peace and prosperity, writes Mikhail Gorbachev, in the preface of his book "Selected Speeches and Articles" that's been published by Pergamon Press.

The presentation of the book to the British public was held at the USSR Embassy in Great Britain on Thursday. Addressing those present, USSR ambassador to Great Britain Leonid Zamyatin noted that Mikhail Gorbachev's book sets out in a well-reasoned way the strategic line of the CPSU, the foundation of the policy of the Soviet state. This is the most authoritative and precise reflection of the new political thinking.

At the presentation of the book were members of the British Parliament, prominent representatives of the political and public circles, figures in science and culture.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1414

## RELATED ISSUES

### PRAVDA REVIEWS UK MP'S VISIT, NATO CW PLANS

PM031311 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jun 86 First Edition p 5

[Boris Orekhov "International Review"]

[Excerpt] The past week contained many important events in the international policy sphere. One of the 52 weeks of the current year [as published], it reflected the complexity of the modern world, the multifarious and contradictory nature of the processes occurring in it, and the vital need for more efforts in the struggle for peace and the peoples' security.

In the socialist countries the period of ruling parties' routine congresses continues, congresses which demonstrate working peoples' unity and cohesion, successes in socialist building, and a commitment to the cause of peace and the peoples' security, and proclaim the struggle for the preservation and consolidation of peace as a main task.

This was also confirmed by the 19th MPRP Congress, which ended in Ulaanbaatar yesterday.

The line of preserving and consolidating world peace is reflected in the socialist countries' concrete foreign policy actions. This week the world was acquainted with the Soviet Government's statements on important international problems. The Soviet Union resolutely condemned NATO's chemical rearmament plans, which threaten fatal consequences for Europe and the whole world, and also the U.S. President's declared refusal to continue observing Soviet-U.S. legal treaty documents on the limitation of strategic offensive armaments -- the 1972 interim agreement and the 1979 SALT II treaty. The Soviet Union will continue to take every measure to reliably ensure the socialist community's security and will go on doing everything necessary to strengthen international security.

### Taking Account of Lessons of the Past

The European Continent has traveled a long and difficult path. And it was here, in Europe, that people first understood that the modern world is too small, cramped, and fragile for a policy of strength, blackmail, threats, and military and other pressure to be pursued in it. Peace cannot be saved or preserved unless there is a resolute and irrevocable repudiation of the kind of thinking in which people viewed wars and military conflicts as acceptable and permissible.

Times have changed. There has been a fundamental change in the armaments that armies possess. The liberated energy of the atom has forced people to reexamine military-strategic concepts and to reexamine the very view of the armed conflict and war. Surely these changes affect no one more tangibly than the Europeans. After all, the fates of dozens of countries and peoples are closely bound together in Europe by geography and history. The European countries, unlike some others, are not separated by oceans thousands of miles wide. And the Europeans can preserve their home and make it more peaceful and secure by collective efforts, following the rational norms of international contact and cooperation.

A British parliamentary delegation headed by Lord Whitelaw recently visited the Soviet Union. In the course of the meetings held during this visit, which attracted broad attention not only in Britain but also throughout Europe, a common understanding of the need to halt the arms race and to seek mutually acceptable solutions to mankind's other problems in the modern complex, contradictory, but interconnected world was expressed.

The visit was useful. That is indicated by the fact that it confirmed the great potential for developing fruitful political dialogue between our country and Britain, economic and cultural ties between them, contacts in the parliamentary sphere, and contacts among people.

But I believe that the main questions examined during the visit to Moscow by Lord Whitelaw and his colleagues were those of ending nuclear tests. That is indeed where Britain could play a significant role. It is appropriate in this connection to think back to 1977 when, on a Soviet initiative, tripartite talks began involving the USSR, the United States, and Britain aimed at elaborating a treaty on a complete and general prohibition of nuclear weapons tests. During those talks, which lasted 3 years, considerable progress was achieved in the formulation of that treaty. But in November 1980 the United States, followed by Britain, refused to continue those talks. Now thought could be given to a Soviet-British initiative aimed at resuming the interrupted talks, especially since at that time the Soviet Union, the United States, and Britain were in agreement that nuclear weapons tests must be banned.

At the 26 May meeting with the British parliamentary delegation, M.S. Gorbachev put forward a new proposal addressed to Britain. Its essence was that if Britain officially decides to eliminate its nuclear weapons, the Soviet Union would be ready to reduce its nuclear potential by an equivalent amount. And if Britain simultaneously removed foreign nuclear weapons from its territory the Soviet Union would also guarantee that Soviet nuclear weapons would not be targeted on British territory and would never be used against Britain.

The Soviet Union thereby answered the question repeatedly raised in Britain, namely, what would the Soviet Union do if Britain eliminated its nuclear weapons? The answer, as we can see, is absolutely businesslike and specific.

The British parliamentarians called the Soviet proposals a useful new initiative and called the exchange of opinions that took place a positive contribution to the development of Soviet-British parliamentary ties. Now, clearly, we must wait for a reaction to the Soviet proposals from the British Government. Our new initiative is backed by a sincere desire to free the world from the nuclear threat and to clear the skies above Europe, whose history urges this. And when the West portrays Soviet initiatives in the disarmament sphere and persistence in the struggle for detente as "Moscow's machinations," as propaganda or utopia, or as a display of weakness, we regard all that as narrow-mindedness [organichennost] and an inability to understand the real state of affairs in the modern world. The essence of the matter is that the Soviet Union is aware of its high degree of responsibility for the fate of human civilization.

## RELATED ISSUES

SOVIET TALK SHOW: ASIAN SECURITY, INF, SALT, TEST BAN, CW

LD011735 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 1 Jun 86

["International Observers Roundtable" program, with Spartak Ivanovich Beglov, APN Political Observer; Yuriy Emmanuilovich Kornilov, TASS Political Observer; Vitaliy Sergeyevich Sobolev, All-Union Radio commentator]

[Excerpts] [Sobolev] Hello, comrades. The 19th Congress of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party [MPRP] was held last week. These highly important political events--congresses of the fraternal parties--have been a feature of the first half of this year. They are of the greatest importance, both to the peoples of their countries, and for the entire socialist community, and for the development of the international situation as a whole.

Under discussion at the MPRP congress was the strengthening of security in Asia, support for the Soviet initiatives in that sphere, and the position and initiatives of the Mongolian People's Republic itself, for example its proposal to set up machinery that would preclude the use of force in relations among states of Asia and the Pacific. In general, the socialist states have worked out a comprehensive program touching on various aspects of security in Asia, have they not, Spartak Ivanovich?

[Beglov] Yes, the region of Asia and the Pacific is possibly most of all in need at present of such a program of action, because in that vast space are concentrated many states and many peoples, and many problems have accumulated which have to be solved, including the problem of detente, elimination of hotbeds of conflict, limitation of the spread of nuclear arms, and stopping the nuclear arms race. In spite of all this, it somehow seems in general that the Asian and Pacific region has so far lacked such a clear and precise reference point.

Well, in recent years, and precisely thanks to the initiatives of the socialist countries, such a program has begun to take shape. First of all, I have in mind the idea put forward by the Soviet Union regarding an integrated approach to the problem of providing for security in Asia. It envisions uniting the efforts of the Asian states and a joint search for ways of strengthening peace in the region. This is not a question of foisting on anyone in Asia some ready-made rigid formula: It is simply a question of getting the representatives of the Asian countries together at last, at various levels. In particular, the Mongolian comrades propose something in the nature of a public forum of representatives of Asia. We ourselves also propose that all this should eventually develop into the creation -- if one may so express it, on the model of the Helsinki process -- of some sort of process of negotiation in which concrete problems could be tackled.

[Kornilov] In other words, what we have in mind is that the Asian countries should jointly participate in drawing up a formula for general Asian security, is that not so, Spartak Ivanovich?

[Beglov] Well, evidently that is just the kind of approach that is needed.

[Sobolev] From the point of view of security in Asia, the state of Soviet-Japanese relations is very important. Unfortunately, a number of aspects of Japan's policy -- its inclusion in the militarist plans of the United States -- are doing nothing to improve the situation in the region. It is all the more important, as the Japanese newspaper SANKEI SHIMBUN has commented, to continue the dialogue, since there is no other way of settling questions on which the positions of our two countries diverge. From this point of view, one ought to emphasize the importance of periodic consultations at the foreign minister level, and, in particular, the visit of Japanese Foreign Minister Abe to the Soviet Union. Altogether, recent days have been rich, as it were, in high-level meetings in Moscow. Let me remind you of the visit to the Soviet Union of Gonzalez, the head of the Spanish Government, the outcome of which has been seen as positive in all respects both in Madrid and in Moscow. Later, there were talks in the Soviet capital with highly placed political figures from Libya and Syria. The Soviet Union's friendly relations with these two countries of the Near East were favorably assessed during the visits and received a new stimulus to development. Much attention, naturally, was given to the problems of the Near East.

[Sobolev] I think we need to mention now that among the important visits to the Soviet capital, of which we were speaking just now, was the arrival of the British parliamentarians. How rich in content their meetings in Moscow were is shown by the fact that they were the first to hear the new Soviet peace proposal addressed to Britain. I remind you that the offer we made was that if Britain officially makes a decision to abolish its nuclear armaments, the Soviet Union would be willing to reduce its nuclear potential to an equivalent extent; and that if Britain were at the same time to remove the foreign nuclear armaments from its territory, the Soviet Union would also guarantee that its nuclear armaments will not be aimed at British territory, and will never be used against Britain.

Implementation of this proposal would change the situation in Europe substantially for the better without detriment to the security of either of the sides. Unfortunately, in a Europe that already has enough arms and problems, the buildup of both continues. The United States intends to increase and diversify, as it were, its arsenals in this European theater of military operations, as they call it; and Western Europe, though in differing degrees, is yielding to the pressure in the name of Atlantic solidarity.

The second half of May was chosen for some of the regular conferences of the leading organs of NATO. At the end of last week the foreign ministers of the countries belonging to this bloc met in Canada, and if one is to believe the U.S. press, Washington confronted them with the task of demonstrating a solidarity that has suffered as a result of the adventurist activities of the U.S. Government in the Middle East and also regarding the arms race.

[Beglov] Vitaliy Sergeyevich, you have said that Western Europe is giving in to U.S. pressure. This is, of course, true overall if one is talking about the behavior of the governments of the leading NATO countries -- I am thinking of those like Great Britain, the FRG to a certain extent, and some others. But if one is to talk about the Western Europe that is represented by the broad public, by ordinary people, then



of course the picture is completely different. The struggle now is taking place around the issue of West European public opinion and the mass parties that represent the working people being able to exert much more influence on the course of events. And this is being felt in the highest echelons of power.

For example, I recently had occasion to visit Greece and this visit coincided exactly with some very dramatic events -- we are all of us now talking about the consequences of the accident at the Chernobyl AES and the way in which Chernobyl has sounded like a bell, drawing people's attention even more to the danger of an atomic war. In the demonstrations and marches and in the antiwar meetings that have been taking place in Greece over the past few days, the call for the spread of nuclear weapons and chemical weapons across Europe to be halted has been heard with increasing force.

Against this background I think that we can say that the implementation of the NATO plans which the United States is still trying to lay down in the old way and to impose -- I think that we can say it is now getting increasingly difficult to implement this line. Look at what happened this week on the question of strategic armaments. The United States announced on the one hand that in connection with the forthcoming launching of the "Nevada" submarine and the fact that the United States will obtain 24 new submarine-based carriers, they will scrap 2 submarines of the Poseidon system. But President Reagan immediately considered it necessary to say that this was being done more for economic reasons. Why was that statement made? Because the President was unable to admit that the main thing behind this action was, in fact, pressure from the public, both in the United States itself and in Western Europe. And immediately, of course, both the Pentagon leaders and Defense Secretary Weinberger, and the President himself, started to threaten that the SALT II treaty is allegedly doomed in any case, to threaten that they will take certain steps by the end of the year which will lead to the violation of the limits that have been set by the treaty, in particular regarding the equipping of bombers with cruise missiles and so on. But the situation is such that when the NATO foreign ministers assembled at the end of the week for their session in Halifax, Canada, it turned out that Washington's position and the attack on the SALT II treaty did not essentially receive support.

[Sobolev] Such steps which are openly aimed at a world arms race and the militarization of open space and at whipping up international tension clearly give rise to concern among U.S. allies and this is indicated by the official statements.

The statement by the Soviet Government concerning Washington's decision not to observe in future the limitations imposed by the SALT II treaty was on the whole, therefore, received with understanding, even among Western observers who are very sympathetic to the United States. This decision makes even more obvious the reason why the United States has such an unconstructive stance at the Geneva talks on nuclear and space weapons, and also on the issue of what a new Soviet-U.S. summit meeting should be like. All people on earth, no matter what their convictions, believe that this meeting will bring concrete results in the field of security. American willingness and the appropriate political atmosphere are essential for this. The decision of the U.S. Administration cuts across these two conditions.

Judging by the first reactions in the press, people abroad have paid the most serious attention to the words of the Soviet statement about the fact that our country will take the necessary practical measures to prevent military and strategic parity from being undermined. This, as is noted by our colleagues on progressive newspapers, is important

not only to ensure the security of the socialist community but to strengthen international security as a whole, too. However, such a development of events is not the choice of the Soviet Union. And it is worth repeating that practically all of its allies have expressed concern in one form or another in connection with Washington's decision.

[Beglov] Approximately the same thing took place in connection with the refusal of the United States to join in the unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions: Because West Europeans, including representatives of governments, are extremely wary. I would even say that they have expressed in an extremely frank way their displeasure at the provocative position of the United States with regard to the problem of a nuclear test ban. In Britain, in particular eminent people have been writing -- I am quoting from the NEW STATESMAN -- that scientists have proved that not one of the arguments given by the U.S. Government in its attempts to frustrate the ban on all nuclear tests has any foundation. As a result, the journal writes, the United States is threatened with finding itself in isolation at the UN disarmament conference that will shortly resume its session and where the question of a treaty on a complete ban on all nuclear tests will again be raised. So, on this question too, it is not so easy for the Americans to impose their will. But...

[Kornilov interrupting] Even the fact that -- I would like to recall this, too, to back up what you have been saying, Spartak Ivanovich -- well, the spring session of the North Atlantic assembly ended in Luxembourg a few days ago. The North Atlantic assembly is a kind of...

[Sobolev interrupting] It is NATO's parliament.

[Kornilov] Yes, yes, and its chairman, Mathias, a U.S. senator, called upon parliamentarians of the 16 NATO member-countries to get the United States to follow the example of the Soviet Union and end nuclear tests, and to get Washington to continue to uphold the existing Soviet-American agreements on arms control. It is quite noteworthy and quite characteristic that even in the NATO parliament, as you call it, even there, calls of this kind resound in full voice.

[Beglov] At the same time we have grounds for saying that the struggle for the program of radical disarmament measures put forward by the Soviet Union and for all the practical actions that are now on the disarmament agenda affecting all types of weapons, this struggle is of course building up.

But it is acquiring an increasingly complicated character, so that on the one hand there are, of course, no grounds for saying that path is wide open for the implementation of these proposals and these initiatives, that all one has to do is stretch out one's hand and agreements are already within reach. But neither must one rush to the other extreme, that is to say, proceed from the position that the United States has succeeded in its desire to block the Soviet proposals. No, this is not what has happened.

If one is to talk about the actual state of affairs, then the policy of the U.S. Administration is essentially now finding itself increasingly in a state of isolation. And this applies even to the latest episode, the one involving chemical weapons, because after the Pentagon had literally stolen agreement from the West Europeans at the end of last week -- I have not been able to find another word to describe it -- they used a procedural trick in order to secure the agreement -- they stole the agreement, the sanction, for the production of binary weapons because this was a requirement of the U.S. Congress. Three times the U.S. Congress rejected attempts by the Pentagon to

obtain allocations for binary weapons and it only agreed to do this on condition that the agreement of the West Europeans was secured for the deployment of these weapons. And so what happened? This agreement was formally given, on the grounds that once the Americans have pointed out the guidelines and the purposes of their plan, then that is sufficient for considering it sanctioned by NATO. But, in fact, as soon as this session had finished, the session of the Defense Planning Committee, one after another the defense ministers who took part in this session from countries like the Netherlands, Denmark, Luxembourg, Norway, and Greece -- and others joined in with them -- said that if there had been a vote, a formal vote, and if there had been a precise procedure for explaining attitudes toward the U.S. plan, then they would have rejected this plan for the deployment of chemical weapons.

[Sobolev] It turns out that only the FRG, Britain, and Turkey are firm supporters of these U.S. plans for binary weapons. The defense ministers of six countries, while they did not object to the production of binary weapons in connection with the situation that you have described, have refused to have them sited on their own territory, whether in the event of crises or in the event of war.

[Kornilov] Be that as it may, NATO's military organs, and the Military Planning Committee at defense minister level in particular, have adopted, under pressure from the United States, under strong pressure, while having their arms twisted -- yes, that is all true -- but they have adopted a decision which sanctions the start of the production of a new generation of chemical weapons -- binary weapons -- in the United States. And NATO's action thereby raises in all its sharpness the question of whether or not there is to be chemical disarmament.

As far as our country's position on this very important problem is concerned, it was set out with extreme precision in the Soviet Government statement published a few days ago, which says: For the Soviet Union, the answer to this question has always been and remains unequivocal. Chemical weapons, which are a fanatical means of mass extermination are to be fully banned and unconditionally destroyed. And the only path to the attainment of this goal lies through political decisions and through verifiable international accords.

[Sobolev] I would again like to draw our listeners' attention to the fact that the initiative for the production of chemical weapons belongs to the Americans, and Washington is increasingly offhand in sweeping aside the views of its NATO allies.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1414

## RELATED ISSUES

### BRIEFS

SOVIET-BULGARIAN CONSULTATIONS--Soviet-Bulgarian consultations on questions of disarmament were held at the Bulgarian Foreign Ministry 26-28 May. Participating in them on the Soviet side was V.L. Israelyan, member of the USSR Foreign Ministry Collegium, and, on the Bulgarian side, K. Tellalov, head of the Bulgarian delegation at the disarmament conference. The participants in the consultations had talks with P. Mladenov, member of the BCP Central Committee Politburo and Bulgarian foreign minister. [TASS report: "Soviet-Bulgarian Consultations"] [Text] [Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 May 86 Morning Edition p 5 PM] /9738

ARCHITECTS AGAINST NUCLEAR WAR--Moscow, 20 May (TASS)--Soviet and U.S. architects called on organizations of architects, designers and planners all over the world to draw more actively into the struggle for liquidating nuclear and chemical weapons and for stopping the arms race. At today's press conference in Moscow they have made public a joint appeal adopted as a result of the visit to the USSR by a delegation of the American organization architects, designers, planners for social responsibility headed by its president Tician Papachristou. A decision was taken during the delegation's visit on setting up the new movement international architects, designers, planners for the prevention of nuclear war. The historic role of architects is to create and preserve the environment for the life and activities of people. Nuclear weapons which can trigger off a nuclear war, is a threat to our cities, dwellings and social life, underlines the appeal. We regard it as our duty to elucidate to our colleagues, the public and political quarters and need for removing the nuclear threat, stopping the arms race and for preventing its shift to space. The appeal emphasizes that architects can and must make a contribution to a noble cause of achieving peace all over the world. Soviet and American architects pointed out that huge funds spent in the world for arms must be used for the good of people and not for the creation of more powerful and dangerous means of destruction. We return to our homeland with confidence that we have reached mutual understanding on the danger facing mankind, Tician Papachristou told the press conference. He acclaimed the Soviet Government's decision to extend the unilateral moratorium on all nuclear tests. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1736 GMT 20 May 86 LD] /9738

CSO: 5200/1414

END